

THE

BC

AMERICAN

CATHOLIC QUARTERLY

REVIEW.

Bonum est homini ut eum veritas vincat volentem, quia malum est homini ut eum veritas vincat invitum. Nam ipsa vincat necesse est, sive negantem sive confitentem.

S. AUG. EPIST. ccxxxviii. AD PASCENT.

VOLUME XVI.

FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER, 1891.

PHILADELPHIA:
HARDY & MAHONY,
PUBLISHERS AND PROPRIETORS,
505 CHESTNUT STREET.

COPYRIGHT, 1891,

BY

HARDY & MAHONY.

70749

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

VOL. XVI.—OCTOBER, 1891.—No. 64.

AQUINAS RESUSCITATUS.

HOWEVER far we may be removed from its immediate influence, the great revival of the study of St. Thomas Aquinas, now in its fiftieth year, can hardly fail to be a subject of interest to those who have the defence and spread of the Catholic faith at heart.

This movement owes its origin chiefly to Cajetan Sanseverino as far back as 1840. He was the first of any note who set his face boldly against that eclecticism in philosophy which had become almost universal in Europe, both among Catholics and Protestants.

The cause was then taken up, sustained, and furthered by Frs. Liberatore, Kleutgen, and a few others; and after a struggle of forty years, it took a more definite shape, when it was officially recognized, approved, and organized by the Encyclical "Aeterni Patris," October 4, 1879.

Its promoters are now very numerous, and as zealous as ever, and they have as their leader and patron the Sovereign Pontiff himself. They are professedly reformers, and that of no very compromising character; for they aim at nothing less than making the "Summa" of St. Thomas the text-book of Christendom, so that it shall be to its philosophy and theology what the missal and breviary are to its liturgy; that is, a universal standard to which all shall conform, whereby all differences shall be, more or less, eliminated, and all schools of opinion merged, as far as possible, into one great Catholic school.

That this estimate of their views is not exaggerated, will best appear from the terms in which the practical conclusion of the Encyclical is summed up: "While, then, we enjoin that whatever wise things others have said, whosoever they be; whatever fruitful discoveries and inventions they have made, should be welcomed with a liberal mind; at the same time we most earnestly exhort you, venerable brethren, for the honor and defence of the Catholic faith, for the advancement of science, for the welfare of society, to restore and spread, far and wide, the golden wisdom of St. Thomas. We say the '*wisdom* of St. Thomas,' for if the scholastics have been in any way over subtle in their inquisitions, or if they have too rashly accepted traditions, or if they have said anything not in keeping with the proven results of later research, or in any way not susceptible of proof, it is far from our intention that they should be followed in these matters. But let carefully chosen professors strive to instil into the minds of their pupils the teaching of Aquinas, and to make them clearly see how it excels all other in point of solidity. And let the academies which you may have already founded, or shall found hereafter, explain and defend his teaching, and apply it to the refutation of prevalent error. And that there may be no confusion between the pretence and the reality, the poisoned waters and the pure, you must take care that this wisdom of St. Thomas is drawn from the fountain-head, or at least from those streams which flow from it, and are, in the unanimous judgment of the most learned, beyond all doubt still pure and undefiled."

Ten days later, referring to this Encyclical in a brief addressed to Cardinal de Lucca, Prefect of Ecclesiastical Studies, the Holy Father says: "We earnestly exhorted the bishops to join their efforts with ours, to restore to the Catholic schools that ancient philosophy which has been pushed out into the cold and almost abandoned, and to replace it in that position of honor which it formerly occupied."

The best commentary on all this is the fact that in the Roman Seminary, which is under the immediate supervision of the Pope, there is no text-book recognized except the "*Summa*" of Aquinas, pure and simple. Furthermore, when we look at the special edition of St. Thomas with its commentaries, and the various reprints of the old scholastics which have been issued in pursuance of the Holy Father's wishes, we cannot but think that by the "pure unmixed streams" from which beginners are to imbibe the system of Aquinas, are meant those interpreters who, like Cajetan, Ferrariensis, Alamannus, etc., simply sought to learn what their master meant, rather than those critical interpreters who do not scruple to depart from him when their reason suggests it, and might perhaps

in some sense rival him as masters themselves. Nor does this in any way lessen the honor due to those great originals, but merely implies that for those whose present and immediate aim is to understand St. Thomas, the more direct and easier route lies elsewhere. It does not mean that they are to be studied less, but later on. Lastly, in more than one case, men of high intellectual attainments and great originality, who were unable to fall in comfortably with the new requirements, and to adapt themselves without reserve to the spirit of the reform, have had to resign their professorial chairs and to give place to others, in some cases, it may be, of inferior genius.

From all this it may be concluded as evident, in the words of a writer in the *Dublin Review* (January, 1880): "that it is intended to effect a very great work; to bring about unity in Catholic philosophy, and that, by the universal adoption of the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas."

Now, the feelings with which this movement is regarded will vary according to the point from which it is viewed. There are, however, two very vigorous types of feeling, the one favorable, the other adverse to it, yet both probably based on an entire misapprehension of its true significance, which we propose to discuss briefly, and to point out the fallacies on which they rely for their intellectual basis. And here we must crave pardon if, for the sake of clearness, we seem altogether to exaggerate the views of those whom we oppose.

We do not pretend to represent any individual cases that have come under our notice, but rather two extreme types,—caricatures if you will,—towards the realization of which many are tending, more or less, but none or very few ever attaining.

First, then, we have those enthusiastic and not altogether discreet admirers of Aquinas, who seem to be quite intolerant of the existence of any other theologians whatever; who seem almost to wish to make the *ipse dixit* of their idol the ultimate solvent of all controversies, and that not only in matters pertaining to faith and philosophy, but even in things belonging to the domain of empirical science. It is his influence as an authority, not as a reasoner, which they desire to see exalted. They seem to regard the "Summa" as containing the last word that is to be said in the science of theology, which for them lies closed up between the covers of St. Thomas, as does the canon of inspired scriptures between those of the Bible. No doubt many, though not all, who incline to this extreme view belong to that school which claims Aquinas as its founder, and which has rendered valuable service to theology by much learned commentary on his works, and by pre-

serving the tradition which regards his system as the most perfect theological method.

We cannot, however, acquit them of the charge of over-exclusiveness in their devotion, in so far as they have sometimes been conservative of the letter rather than of the spirit of their master, who, in the words of Bacon (no friend of the schools), 'had the largest heart of all the school divines.'

It has often been said, and very truly, that the blind admirers of an original are his worst enemies, since they imitate him in everything except his originality—" *inimici hominis domestici ejus*;" his sayings, doings and institutions are petrified into models for slavish imitation; the principles from which they spring are trodden underfoot; the spirit which quickened them and moulded them to the circumstances of the past is forgotten. That this general law, founded in the weakness of our nature, has been to some extent verified in the school to which St. Thomas especially belongs, is of course to be expected. To some extent only; for in every school there are to be found many men of wide and comprehensive mind capable of truly appreciating the tenets and principles they profess to maintain, but the majority will necessarily be made up of unoriginal, imitative minds, and in most cases the numerical majority gives the tone to the whole. It may well be that some of these extreme enthusiasts hail with delight the revival of the study of Aquinas, and regard the patronage and approval which the Holy Father has accorded to it as a sort of *ex cathedra* declaration in favor of all exclusively Thomistic opinions. "*Roma locuta est*" they would seem to say—really meaning, therefore, that the question of physical predetermination and many others of the same kind are forever at rest.

Surely, this would be a complete misinterpretation of the mind of the Roman Pontiff. If, indeed, St. Thomas were to be taken as a guide in this exclusive sense, the narrowing result of such a system would be disastrous in the extreme. In no way would it be a true revival of the teaching of St. Thomas, while it would be the death-blow to theology as a living science, capable of indefinite evolution and perfection. And, indeed, it must be acknowledged that whatever efforts have been made in these latter days to arouse theology from its long-continued lethargy, whatever has been done in the way of reconciling differences and of meeting contemporary error on its own ground and combating it with its own weapons, is to be ascribed, as a rule, not to the exclusive followers of any of the old masters, but to eclectics who belonged to no particular school, while more or less approving of all.

And now, in direct opposition to these enthusiasts (whose tendency is somewhat retrograde, in that they regard a return to the

past as the only remedy for present evils), we have many very zealous Catholics who are keenly alive to the intellectual needs of the present day, and also to the inability of so many of our clergy to supply them. As in every other line, so in this—the harvest is great, the laborers few and inefficient. They are therefore impatient to see an immediate and direct application of clerical studies to the circumstances of our own times. It was not so in the days when theology was commonly regarded as the queen of sciences, and was by itself sufficient to rank a man with the most highly educated. Not only with a view to the work of education of youth, but in order to be able to understand the minds with which they have to deal, and to command that respect which is due to their office, it is needful that priests should be not only theologians, but also men of general education, which now-a-days requires a considerably prolonged period of preparation. And so they feel that the method of the old schools, with its lengthy lectures, its formal disputations (so unlike newspaper controversy), is intolerably cumbersome, and though respect seals their lips, they fret inwardly at what seems to them a short-sighted conservatism, lazily cleaving to an effete and unpractical system. Seven years seems to them far too large a proportion of one's education time to devote to the study of an antiquated form of theology which needs so much alteration before it can be applied to present purposes. "Why should we concern ourselves with the errors of Manichæus or Pelagius, of Avicenna or Averrhoes? It is not the Mahometan, but the atheist, the pantheist, the agnostic whom we have to encounter now. How can a book written to suit the needs of the thirteenth century be applied to those of the nineteenth? Heresy will soon be a thing of the past. Time is making evident to all what was always true, namely, the untenableness of any position between pure rationalism and absolute submission to a living revelation. Consequently, to be able to prove the existence of a revelation, to point to the Church as its only legitimate guardian and interpreter, is the most pressing, the only essential part of theological education in these days. And yet where are we to look in the "Summa" for a treatise *de vera religione* or *de ecclesia* as those questions have to be treated now? Where are we to find answers to those hosts of difficulties raised by sciences which had practically no existence in the days of St. Thomas?" "We have every respect," say they, "for St. Thomas, and we are always proud to be able to quote him in favor of our views. But as he was a man of his time, so let us be men of ours. Let us bring our philosophy to bear directly on the false philosophies of our contemporaries. Of course, we must first learn our own position. But for this let manuals suffice. After all, the authors of these manuals have

drawn, directly or indirectly, from the old masters all that is best and most needful for present emergencies. And by this means we shall have leisure to read up Kant and Hegel, Spencer, Mill, Bacon and the rest of these great bugbears; and having read them, to write clever articles about them in their own easy, self-confident style; we shall be able to prepare ourselves for the lecture-room and for that glorious arena of small controversy, the railway carriage; we shall be able to *think* in English, and, consequently, when we do appear in print, to express our thoughts in a manner intelligible to our contemporaries, and not in the rigid mould and pedantic phraseology of antiquity. In a word, we shall be up to date, and shall be men of our time in every respect consistent with our duty as Catholics."

To those who look at the matter in this light, the revival of the study of St. Thomas is by no means welcome, except as an index of the general reawakening of mental activity in the interests of theology. They sacredly believe and hope that it is only a passing phase, perhaps a passing craze; that as it owes its strength mainly to the influence of the present Pope, so when that influence is withdrawn the "Summa" will once more be put on the shelf, and text-books, as before, will increase and multiply and replenish the earth and subdue it.

There is much, very much, to sympathize with in the position of these well-intentioned utilitarians, and yet, while admitting many of their premises, we cannot but think that their practical conclusion is rather rash and short-sighted. We think that they are looking to the greatest present result, and not to the greatest eventual gain; that they are considering the solitary laborer, and not him who is but a part of one great mechanism. The perfectly isolated worker, if such there now be, may direct his preparation exclusively to those needs and opportunities with which he will come in direct personal contact. If a philanthropist, he may prepare himself to do as much good as lies within the power of one man to effect in the course of a short life, and without assistance. But if he be a man of wider views, he will see that in most cases he will effect far more good eventually by performing his duty as a member of an organized body devoted to philanthropic ends, however remotely that duty may bear on the happiness of others, however impatient he may naturally be to see the fruit of his labor, however unwilling to be able to claim a merely fractional share in the result.

Now the Church is an organized body, of which the clergy are active members. She looks at the present with loving anxiety and pain, but she has also to look far into the future, and to consider the millions of her yet unborn children, and the manifold thorny

dangers which, now only in seed, may spring up hereafter to choke the good grain. She knows how false a zeal it is which would "take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs," that would turn away the intellectual energies of her priests from the work of illustrating and harmonizing the mysteries of faith, by which the minds of her saints are fed and enlightened, in order to silence the barking of dogs, who deny the very existence of that faith. To preserve and cherish the souls within her pale is her first care; her second (not co-ordinate but subordinate), to save the wanderers without, and draw them into the fold. As it is by sanctifying himself, and in no other way, that a man best consults for the sanctification of his neighbor, so it is by turning our energies inward, and by perfecting ourselves as a body, that we shall actually and most effectually exercise our apostolate to the world at large. Controversy and polemics have their legitimate sphere, but they are not the be-all and end-all of theology. It is well and needful for the faithful to see that their religion is able to defend itself against the charge of unreasonableness. And for those who are already sincerely seeking the truth, whose will has been, by other means, disposed toward the Church, the solution of difficulties is often a necessary condition for the completion of the good work, a *causa removens prohibens*. But if we look for the motive power, the efficient cause, it is by the cords of love and through the will that men are drawn into the Church, and not by the haggling of controversy. It may be the beauty, sublimity, and intimate harmony of Catholic doctrine which first exerts a spell; it may be the repose and peace which submission to an infallible authority affords to the thought-wearied mind; it may be the help and consolation of the sacraments, the Eucharistic *Schechina* which hallows our churches; it may be the gentle glory of the Saints, the only adequate fruit of the Catholic religion by which the tree can be tested; it may be the self-sacrifice of such men as Father Damien, and hundreds of men and women, who, in or out of religious orders, lead lives as heroic as his; it is often admiration for what the Church has done in advocating the cause of the poor, in maintaining liberty and order in due proportion; it is sometimes even the grace and dignity of her rites, the majesty of her temples, which gives the will its first bent contrary to that which it received by education. These are the arguments that tell; these the weapons of the most fruitful controversy of all.

Having thus pointed out these two contrary, and we believe quite incorrect, views of the significance of the Thomistic revival (a term whose misinterpretation has now been guarded against), we may venture to give what we believe to be the true interpretation of the mind of the Holy Father as shown in the Encyclical *Acterni*

Patris, and in his subsequent action in furtherance of the wishes therein expressed.

While, on the one hand, we should not exaggerate, on the other, we should not underrate so solemn and deliberate a disciplinary measure of a Pontiff so eminently liberal-minded and enlightened, keenly alive to the peculiar needs of the Church in the nineteenth century; of one so conciliatory, so utterly incapable of imposing his private opinions and idiosyncrasies on numbers of men of opposite views without grave and wide-spreading reasons. Nor is it likely that in a matter so intimately connected with the evolution, defence and spread of the Christian faith that the assistance, or even the guidance of the Holy Spirit would be wanting.

It will help very much to the formation of a correct opinion on this subject to have a clear idea of the distinction between positive and scientific or scholastic theology. Positive knowledge in any department is that acquaintance with facts, conclusions, or even arguments, which is acquired by way of information, whether for the sake of one's own mental improvement or with a view to imparting the same to others. It remains in the mind as it entered it. It is not dissected or analyzed, with a view to extracting the principle involved, or separating the general from the particular. Thus, one may acquire historical knowledge, to gratify his natural and laudable curiosity, or with a view to teaching others, or in order to furnish materials for the scientific historian and the sociologist. But the latter values this information, not for what it is in itself, but for what he can draw out of it, namely, the theories and laws of social life and its conditions.

Now the scientist, in whatever department, needs a long and careful preparation for his work. First of all, he must know what a science is, and for this he must go to logic, which treats about science in general, and as a practical issue lays down those rules for the conduct of reasoning which constitute the art of speculation. Besides knowing the art, he must acquire skill in the application of its rules, and for this it will be well to apply them first to some of those sciences the nature of whose object is wholly comprehensible to man, being in some sense the creation of his own mind, such as numbers, measurements, mechanical contrivances, and the like. Here the terminology can be most exact and free from ambiguity, and there is no room for other fallacies than those of form. When he has acquired some skill in these matters, he may pass on to those sciences which deal with natures more or less obscure, and where the terms are open to ambiguous interpretation, and there is need of very careful distinction in order to guard against "real" fallacies. According then to the complexity of the subject-matter, the scientist will need more or less gymnastic train-

ing in the subtillies peculiar to it before he can even begin to labor at the extension and improvement of the science in question.¹

Now it will be quite plain to the most casual reader that the Encyclical has in view the scientific (that is, the scholastic) and not the positive theologian. The distinction is one that has been always recognized *theoretically*, and is most necessary for the work of the Church. In old times, the episcopal seminaries were schools of positive theology, while the university course was scholastic or scientific. To know the received conclusions and the arguments by which they are defended from ordinary objections is the part of the positive theologian. To find new arguments, to advance to new conclusions, to be ready for all possible difficulties, is, among other things, the part of the scholastic theologian. Positive theology is a weapon offensive and defensive for particular foreseen emergencies; scholastic theology is a weapon of universal applicability, or rather a skill to fashion weapons suited to the most unforeseen assaults. A course of positive theology is something final, at the end of which a man is fit to preach and catechise; a course of scholastic theology is essentially preparatory, at the end of which a man is not fit to teach, but only to prepare himself for teaching theology to others. In an examination, an unsound opinion is a fatal error in the positive theologian, while a fallacious argument is but venial; whereas the converse is true as regards the student of scholastic theology. To be perfect in either sphere requires powers of a very high order, though wholly distinct in kind. Those necessary for the positive theologian are more generally useful and fortunately more widely diffused.

Practically, however, the distinction has been much overlooked, owing, no doubt to the almost complete oblivion into which scholastic philosophy had fallen, until about fifty years ago; and so we still find many who speak of the difference as one of degree rather than of kind. "The scholastic theologian shall go *more* into the reasons of things," say they. And if we take up text-books professing to belong to these different departments, we often find little beyond the title-page and the dimensions to tell us to which we should assign it. All alike argue successively from Scripture, from the Councils, from the Fathers, from reason, varying, perhaps, only in the proportion of the ingredients. All are padded with exegetical and historical discussions and controversies set forth, as a rule, not in the clear, unpretending scholastic dialect, but in dis-

¹ By *subtilty*, here and throughout, we do not mean that ingenious trifling with which the later schoolmen have been rightly or wrongly accredited, and which cannot be too severely condemned, but that accuracy and keenness of perception, that exactitude of expression which is the antithesis, not of depth, but of obscurity; not of breadth, but of vagueness.

cursive and would-be rhetorical Latin which disgusts the learned and puzzles the unlearned. All seem to suppose—what in most cases is quite true—that the student is never to have leisure to study Holy Scripture, or the Councils, or the Fathers, for himself, and therefore must find within the limits of one or two small volumes, all that he is ever to know of scholastic, dogmatic and patristic theology.

Naturally enough, the beginner wonders if three years' drilling in scholastic philosophy is really such a very essential prerequisite to the study of theology; and whether common sense and a few weeks would not be amply sufficient for the purpose. In truth, the tradition dates from the time when scholastic theology was in full vigor. But for one who really appreciates what is meant by scholastic theology, and the relation (so well set forth in our Encyclical) which Aristotelian philosophy bears to it, three years is even too short a time to leave any room for those encounters with current philosophical heresies, with which so much of that valuable time is wasted, and to so little purpose.

Of course, the scholastic theologian before he can teach, must know all that the positive theologian knows, and much more; but his aim as a *student* is to cultivate the subtle habit of mind needful for one who intends to *work at* the science eventually. This is not simply to practice logic, as some may object, but to practice the *application* of logic to the most difficult and complex matter, and to get well acquainted with the windings and turnings of the way. We can well understand how it is possible, and not uncommon, for a man to know a text-book of scholastic theology from end to end, to repeat the arguments glibly, to solve the usual objections, and, at the same time, to be a mere intellectual cripple as far as any original work is concerned—much as little boys who are crammed rather than taught, will rattle off the propositions of Euclid and as many problems as have been done for them, provided the letters are the same and the figures not turned topsyturvy.

This sort of thing will no more make a theologian than to learn a volume of sermons by heart will make a preacher; this will in no way conduce to that subtle habit of mind which will make it possible to solve new and unforeseen difficulties by recourse to first principles however remote. He alone can alter and adapt, who thoroughly understands the principles of construction.

The greatest difficulty presented by this high standard of the requirements of the scholastic theologian is that relating to the time to be consumed in merely preparatory work. There are now "so many worlds, so much to do," so great a harvest, so few laborers. Besides the ministry of the Word, there is the ministry

of the sacraments, the education of youth, the service of the poor, all matters of urgent importance for the Church. Certainly, if a man is to be an accomplished theologian, he cannot hope to be a distinguished historian, mathematician or linguist; if at the end of his seven years he is only fit to begin to *work at* the science, how long shall we have to wait for him if he is to be an active missionary, an eloquent preacher, a finished mathematician, or a profound classical scholar? In truth, nothing can be done now-a-days without specialization and co-operation. To be perfect in any one of the above lines is the work of a lifetime; and for the rest, a man must be content with just sufficient ability to enable him to act as a stop-gap on an emergency. This is the sacrifice which all must now make, who desire to be masters in any one of the many mansions of knowledge.

As regards the preservation, defence and spread of Christian doctrine, it is quite sufficient for the large majority of the clergy in their ordinary intercourse with the world, to know clearly the explanations, arguments and solutions that have been elaborated by proficient in theology. But this supposes that there are some—and they need not be relatively many—who are set apart for this work of elaboration, who supply the weapons to others, or alter them to suit new requirements. For these, indeed, long training and life-long devotion is almost indispensable.

The writer in the *Dublin Review*, already referred to, predicts that in order to carry out this new reform, it will be found necessary to prolong the time given to the study of theology. This only shows how impossible it is to suppose that it is intended to subject all the clergy indiscriminately to so elaborate a training, for where is the time to come from? Therefore another consequence will be that fewer will be able to attempt the higher course of theology. And since it is impossible to have a double staff of professors in every theologate, for the sake of ten per cent. or less of the students, we might predict as another consequence, the specialization of colleges to each of the branches, positive and scholastic.

We have next to consider the expediency of imposing as a standard upon all students of scientific theology, during the period of their preparation, the works of some great master, such as St. Thomas Aquinas. The reasons are very urgent, and we think very obviously so.

No one can fail to see how needful it is in a world-wide perpetual institution, like the Christian Church, to have a catholic language, such as Latin, which from the very fact of its being a dead language, can be used to register and express ideas with an exactness approaching that of purely arbitrary signs, retaining the same value

for all differences of place and time. Now theology, like every other science, is forwarded and perfected by nothing so much as by the interchange of ideas between men of different countries and different casts of thought, and by the comparison of the past with the present; and everything that facilitates this communion and intercourse, is, so far, to be desired. It is with a view to this, that Latin has been adopted in the West as the common language of the schools and Councils. But, in the case of very abstract and subtle questions, such as occur in philosophy and scientific theology, this alone is not sufficient to secure this interchange of ideas without much friction, waste of time and energy, and other grave inconveniences. For here it is necessary, sometimes, to coin new words and phrases, and sometimes to take old words and phrases which, by nature signify ordinary and familiar notions, and to apply them to the expression of reflex ideas, often differing from one another by the merest shade of meaning. No common language is fit for this purpose, save by the use of such circumlocutions as would make converse impossible. If, in natural philosophy, a fixed terminology and symbolism is necessary, how much more so in mental philosophy. When there is question of naming an external object, we can point to it and say: "Let us call this *e.g.*, a zoophite, and that a trilobite"; but when we have to name mental processes, modes, ratios, abstractions, analogies, and the like, it is very difficult to be sure that each has the same idea in his head; for, we cannot read the thoughts of another, save in the blurred type of material signs. It is just possible, by a tedious process of induction, and after many mistakes and explanations, for two minds to be certain that each has the same thought as the other; and then, indeed, if they agree about terminology, it will be possible for them to converse intelligently about it afterwards. But a like labor must be undergone by every other mind in order to understand the term in question; and this it is that makes abstract studies so very difficult, and why, in old times, they were deferred till the mind was matured and hardened.

All this shows the great need of having one way of looking at and speaking of philosophical notions; and this can only be secured by taking some one mind as the standard for all; not a living, changing mind; but a mind registered and fixed for ever on paper. There are few students who have not lost hours and hours of time, and suffered endless annoyance, owing to the diverse senses which authors attach to the same terms. A very slight error in terminology is usually enormous in its consequences—a little thing in itself, but quite capable of throwing the whole machinery of the mind out of gear. Is it too much to say, that at least half of the internal controversies of Catholic the-

ologians and philosophers, which fill the pages of our textbooks, and puzzle and discourage the beginner, owe their origin to the lack of this strict uniformity in the use of terms? How else is it possible that, in most of these disputes, each party claims St. Thomas in support of his opinion? Or, that men can refer to his writings for years, and yet deny that he taught principles which those who have made him their special study declare to be essential to his system, and to permeate his thought from beginning to end? When we have such able men, on both sides, is it not much more reasonable to impute these differences to some variety in the meaning attached to elementary terms and axioms, than to the stupidity or ignorance with which they are sometimes inclined to upbraid one another? Nor is it altogether with a view to interchange of ideas, but even for the successful issue of our own solitary reasoning, that an accurately-defined terminology is needed. As a matter of fact, though we might, yet we never do, determine within ourselves to give a fixed meaning to a certain expression, but we take words as we find them used by others, with all that ambiguity and vagueness which makes thought tiresome and profitless.

Allowing the need of choosing some of the great doctors as a standard, the reasons for giving the preference to St. Thomas, which are so fully set forth in the Encyclical "Aeterni Patris," are not likely to be disputed. It may, not, however be amiss to quote what has been so well said by Rev. Dr. Wm. Barry, in the *Contemporary Review*, for November, 1883 ("The New Birth of Christian Philosophy"): "In this name (St. Thomas Aquinas), so well known to Catholic metaphysicians—so dim and distant to the world at large—the strength and beauty of mediævalism, as a system of thought, are forever expressed. Aquinas is the thinker, as Dante is the poet, of thirteenth-century Christianity; and the 'Paradise' of Dante, which to Carlyle seemed inarticulate music, borrows its noblest rhythms, and most lovely conceptions, from that other poem, the 'Summa Theologica'; or, employing a more suggestive comparison, as the modern world reads Aristotle with the eyes of Kant, so the mediæval read him with those of the *Angelic Doctor*—as Catholics style St. Thomas. Others were as original, or more so; and one, Albertus Magnus of Cologne, possessed a knowledge of natural science, which in the 'Summa' we do not find; but none were so faithful to the spirit of Aristotle, or comprehended with so clear a glance the bearings of Christian doctrines on Christianity as a whole. His characteristic is *balance*, or the power of adjusting seemingly opposed statements, so that they shall throw light upon each other—a power which might be termed artistic by the Greeks, and architectonic by Aristotle. It is the faculty of

proving by systematizing; of winning a demonstration by marshalling a number of theses in their metaphysical order; or, of indicating the composition of thought in its relation to being."

And further on with reference to his style and terminology, he says: "No writer has ever been more lucid; and he possesses the charm of lucidity; for, to read him refreshes, and does not tire. His Latin, which is curiously like Greek in construction, and what I may call tone, is a subtle instrument, never rhetorical, eschewing the slightest ornament; but, full of the peculiar grace of an exquisite logical arrangement, it has the conciseness and strength of the highest algebra. He is never ruffled, or moved from the calm that mediæval cloisters created around him; his dispassionateness, in our times, would, by the superficial be suspected as indifference, for in all he has written, there is no word of personal rebuke for his adversaries. He cannot be angry; and his only way of striking an enemy down, is to offer him a fresh argument."

Again, a writer in the *Dublin Review*, for April, 1880 ("Text-books of Philosophy") says: "It is indisputably true, that scholastic philosophy owes its form, its compensative completeness, its harmony with Revelation, and the subtle illumination which it derives everywhere from Revelation, to St. Thomas of Aquin. But what he in Latin began, his successors and disciples in Latin continued. St. Thomas may be almost said to have invented a new dialect of Latin. Without denying the power and influence of those who preceded him, and especially of Blessed Albert the Great—who would have been a worthy leader and patron of the great Dominican school, had there been no Thomas to succeed him—it may be said, with perfect truth, that he formed a language, somewhat in the sense in which the 'Divina Commedia' formed a language. The Latin of the 'Summa Theologica' is as remote from the Latin of Cicero, or even of Seneca, as is Italian or Spanish. But it is a true language, having a body of terms, a regular and unique construction, a perfect flexibility, and above all—what may be considered as the test of a cultured language—an altogether marvellous capacity for the deft expression of abstract thought and speculation."¹

It may perhaps be objected, that it will be morally impossible now, to fix the precise meaning which St. Thomas attached to the terms and axioms which he used. In reply, it may be said, that to do so indeed is a work of laborious induction and comparison, far beyond the power of any solitary theologian; and involving a comparative study, not only of all the works of Aquinas, but of those of his contemporaries and immediate followers. This is a task for a college or school such as the present "Accademia di

¹ Cf. Milman's *History of Lat. Christianity*, viii., p. 265, *sqq.*

San Tommaso;" and will for a time no doubt, give rise to a certain amount of dispute; but must be eventually completed. No private individual, unassisted by a commentary, could determine the exact shade of meaning which many common words bore in Shakespeare's mind, but this has now been fairly determined by the continual labor of commentators; and as long as these commentaries themselves are not antiquated, the meaning of a word used in the Shakesperean sense is something fixed and unalterable for all time. For the student of St. Thomas, such a guide or commentary will always be needed, and it will be the duty of those who undertake to supply such a want to divest themselves of all prepossession as to what they would *wish* the text to mean, and confine themselves strictly to proving by induction what it does mean. How often do we find books professing to be introductions to the study of St. Thomas, whose sole aim is to read into the words of Aquinas, the peculiar opinions of the author or his party.

And so we may conclude, that as he who wishes to be a profound lawyer will not think it waste of time to study the pandects of Justinian, and ancient codes relating to long-forgotten politics, whose value does not lie in their immediate applicability to present circumstances, but to their embodying and exemplifying all the principles of just legislation, and serving as a guide for the construction and alteration of modern codes; so for a deep and thorough mastery of theology it is a most necessary preparation to master that great master who, with his eyes fixed on the crucifix drew his wisdom *ex fontibus Salvatoris*.

It is then, to the trained scholastic theologian alone, that the Church must look in the future for the intellectual defence of the faith; for he alone will be able to supply weapons to those whose ministry leaves them no time to forge them for themselves.

Even for the advance and improvement of apologetic theology, for the critical study of scripture, of ecclesiastical history, for the refutation of sophistical philosophy in every department, nothing is so primarily necessary as the power of seeing far into the remotest consequences of principles, and detecting the fallacies lurking in the labyrinths of plausibility. He who has thoroughly mastered any one system, whatever it be; who has not been mastered by it, or enslaved to it, but has trained his intellect to abstract from its private assents and prepossessions and to follow the workings of another mind, will be able with least difficulty to comprehend the ideas of a different system.

Of course, it will be needful for the scholastic theologian, as soon as he has secured his own fortifications, to familiarize himself with the enemy's ground, and with a view to active operations he must acquaint himself fully with the language and terminology of his

opponents. But it may be questioned whether the failure that has sometimes attended the attempts to put Catholic theology and philosophy into English garb, is not just as much due to hazy and indistinct notions as to any literary deficiency. Certainly, it is the experience of most, that as one's own ideas grow more clearly defined, it becomes easier to express them in the mother-tongue.

Finally, the interests of moral theology will be best cared for by this new system if it should ever prevail. Here, if anywhere, there not only remains much to be done yet in the way of organizing and completing the science; but there is always a standing need of new adaptation to the ever-varying circumstances of social life. And for this work of completion and adaptation he will be most fit who has been well drilled in the second part of the "Summa," for he alone can adapt who understands the principles of construction, as has been said before. It is needless to say that, as a direct preparation for the work of the confessional, manuals will always be necessary and sufficient, since to a great extent the knowledge required is positive, and to dream of confining one's attention to St. Thomas in such matters would be wildly impractical. Yet after this necessary knowledge has been secured, its fruitfulness may be multiplied thirty-, sixty-, or a hundred-fold by digging deep about its roots.

Before concluding, the writer would wish to guard against any misapprehension that might arise as to the practical bearings of this article from his very hasty and inadequate treatment of so difficult a question. It is *not* contended here that every priest shall receive his theology directly from the "Summa Theologica," but only those, and all those, whose duty it will be to teach that science to others; those, in other words, who are studying for the doctorate. This will be quite sufficient to secure the desired uniformity in method and terminology; for the large majority of the clergy, text-books will still have their legitimate use.

It is not supposed that the young student of scholastic theology should be allowed to flounder about in the "Summa" in a desultory fashion, but that he should hear an orderly course of lectures on the text by efficient professors, themselves masters of the system. It is not for a moment intended that Suarez, Billuart, De Lugo, Gonet, Petavius, etc., should be studied less than heretofore, but that they should be approached with a mature mind already master of one system, and not at an earlier period when their study would be productive of confusion rather than of light. Lastly, it is contended that if the standard for the doctorate in theology be raised, and the time of preparation lengthened, the gain will, in the long run, be enormous for the Church, although the relative number of such specialists will necessarily decrease.

And now, if the Angel of the Schools, that wide and gentle spirit, comes amongst us once more with his "golden wisdom," he comes to a world older and wiser by centuries of bitter experience. Look at his philosophy, even as it is now, just awakening from its long torpor, and shaking itself free from the grave-clothes in which it has been cramped and confined. Is there any other system like it which has been so widely received,—as widely as the Catholic faith itself; that has had so many master-minds at work upon it, and that for so long a time, whose every point has been so keenly contested, over and over again, that from the very nature of the case it is impossible to find it at variance with itself? Has any philosophy ever had such a genesis, such a trial as this, the philosophy of the strong common-sense of mankind; that realism which is engrained in our very nature, and cannot be shaken off in practice even by its most bitter opponents, but must and therefore will prevail as long as man is a "rational animal," and continues to be born with five senses and a mind as blank as a clean sheet of note-paper.

It was by stimulating thought that scholastic philosophy began first to be felt as a power, and gradually filled the mediæval universities with thousands of eager, active minds, all speaking, as it were, one great mind-language, and at last culminated in the production of the "*Summa Theologica*" of Aquinas.

But as soon as the worship due to the spirit was insensibly diverted to the letter; as soon as the "*ipse dixit*" of St. Thomas took the place of the criterion by which he himself was guided; as soon as the system changed its political sway for a despotism, opposing itself to the irresistible force of progressive thought, it began to sink into that oblivion which eventually became its grave. And as it withered away, there grew up in its place the false spirit of eclectic philosophy, whose disciples went about plucking the prettiest flowers along the wayside and arranging them in bouquets, lifeless and rootless, destined to fade in the hand of the gatherer, and to be then thrown away and forgotten. And so for a remedy it will not be sufficient to return to St. Thomas unless we return to him in his own liberal spirit, with his large-hearted sympathy for others, and his single intention for the glory of God and the honor of His Holy Church.

One who had the kindness to read this paper through and to make valuable suggestions, asked, amongst other things, if St. Thomas were alive now, would he recommend the study of his own "*Summa*?" Would he not rather sit down and write a philosophy directed against the errors current in our own day? But it seems to me that this question is somewhat beside the mark. We may confidently appeal from what St. Thomas did to what he

would do. He saw that the mastery of Aristotle was eventually the shortest way to master and refute the errors of the thirteenth century. So we may presume that were it possible to find some one now precisely like-minded with St. Thomas, he would for similar reasons recognize the study of the thirteenth century Doctor as the fittest foundation for ecclesiastical training. What can be more in the spirit of modern enlightenment than the critical study of the thought of distant ages and countries. Of course, were such a study not conducted with a broad and open mind; were it directed to the formation of premature assents, it would infallibly produce that narrowness and mental paralysis which it is precisely designed to correct. All attempts to modernize and adapt St. Thomas imply that he is to be studied as a rule of philosophical and theological certitude rather than as a pattern of ancient method and forms of thought. Studied in an enlightened spirit, even his physics would be both interesting and instructive. By not forcing the beginner to yield a premature assent to what he really does not yet understand and cannot accept, he will eventually be led to accept a great deal more than he would otherwise be inclined to do.

No doubt were St. Thomas to come on earth again, he would make many alterations in his writings, but they would rather be in the direction of separating abstract philosophy more entirely from physics than of adapting it to modern discoveries and hypotheses, and would render it to a still greater extent independent of the vicissitudes of experimental science. For certainly the fault of metaphysicians in the past has been an over-readiness to yield credence to the physicist.

DEVELOPMENT OF ENGLISH CATHOLIC
LITERATURE.

BEFORE the time of Catholic Emancipation (1829) English Catholic literature was under a ban. If an English Catholic happened to possess a Catholic book, he might carry it in his pocket, but he would not carry it in his hand, for fear of the gibes or the "informing" of the Papist-hunters. In the libraries of the Catholic gentry there would be a few well-known, treasured books, but to the outside world a "Popish book" would be almost as rare a curiosity as a copy of the Koran or of the Vedas. Imagine a Catholic literature so much as existing in a country where priests had to go about dressed in a suit of brown cloth, so as to escape the insults which would be offered to their office, or where, as an old Oscotian could describe his experience (in the year 1805): "we could seldom walk in the streets without being jeered at; when we said Mass it was in a garret or in some obscure locality, and we were occasionally hooted or had stones thrown at us." The literature of such a caste would not have been popular. It would have been thought fit pabulum for the attentions of the public hangman. And yet, spite of the woful ignorance of the Protestant Dark Ages, there was the same knowledge of Catholic doctrines among English Catholics as there is in these days of much writing.

The second period was when, at the dawn of Catholic Emancipation, such names as Milner, Challoner, Lingard, Alban Butler and Wiseman attracted more or less popular attention; so that even the newspapers (few in number) took note of their writings, and Anglican clergymen stooped to "reply" to their apologies. Perhaps the most prolific of the writers of that period was the ever-to-be-revered Bishop Milner, who, fearless in temperament as he was single in purpose, attacked a nation with equal boldness and severity. Every Catholic now knows "The End of Controversy," published about the year 1824 by the Vicar-Apostolic of the Midland District, but every Catholic does not know the storm of Answers, of Confutations, which this most admirable series of letters quickly evoked. Innumerable historical fragments by the same fertile writer both preceded and followed "The End of Controversy;" besides voluminous correspondence on political questions of the period and on controversies which in these days have lost their interest. We can imagine the sense of literary isolation with which an almost alone Catholic champion must have attacked

a nation which was Protestant to the core. Holes and corners were the accustomed retreats of learned Catholics. Great praise—historic praise—is due to those few noblemen and gentlemen whose houses were always the homes of the Catholic priesthood, and but for whom, through two centuries, there would have been little chance of classic repose for the harried Papists whom a nation looked upon as rebels. Contrast two such periods as 1790 and 1850; contrast the feelings of Bishop Milner, who, in 1790, preached a sermon, in the private chapel of Lulworth Castle, on the occasion of the consecration of Dr. Gibson to the “in partibus infidelium” bishopric of Acanthos, with the feelings of Dr. Newman, who, in 1850, preached a sermon in the new church of St. Mary, Oscott, on the occasion of the formal opening of the splendid college. Sixty years had brought the “Second Spring” out of the long winter, and from that moment a sort of Catholic summer came into prospect.

Another honored literary name is that of Bishop Challoner, whose “*Britannia Sancta*, or lives of the most celebrated English, Scottish and Irish Saints” (published somewhere about 1750); whose “*Unerring Authority of the Catholic Church in Matters of Faith*,” and whose numerous ascetical and expository publications give him high place in præ-Emancipation distinction. Nor must we omit Alban Butler, whose “*History of the Primitive Church*,” whose “*Lives of the Popes*,” whose “*Lives of the Fathers, Martyrs and other Principal Saints*,” and also whose “*Lives of Irish Saints*” have entitled him to a niche in literary fame.—Dr. Lingard, again, is a name worthy to be honored, considering the painful times in which he wrote, and certainly the bitter “replies” which were made to his Catholic statements showed how earnestly and how honestly he worked for truth.

Yet the name of Wiseman will naturally command most respect, because of the now historical association of that name with the restoration of the English Catholic hierarchy. Some notion may be derived of the bitter antagonism of the English people to the Catholic products of Dr. Wiseman’s prolific pen, from the mere titles of scores of pamphlets and lampoons which were issued in “confutation” of his writings. We may read in the catalogue of the British Museum library any number of such nasty titles as “*Dr. Wiseman’s Popish Literary Blunders Exposed*,” “*Popish Frauds Exemplified by Dr. Wiseman’s Lectures*,” “*Idolatry of the Church of Rome Proved out of Dr. Wiseman’s Third Lecture*,” and so on. This was the sort of angry and feeble twaddle which was thought good enough for the learned and accomplished critic who wrote such admirable essays on Christian Art, whose “*Recollections of the Last Four Popes and of Rome in Their Days*,”

might well have tempered the ferocity of national bigotry; whose "Points of Contact between Science and Art," or whose essay on the "Prospects of Beautiful Architecture in England" might have taught refinement in controversy to his adversaries; or whose "Fabiola," whose "Hidden Gem," showed the delicacy of a powerful mind, not likely to be roughly swayed by mere bullying. But the fortress of national bigotry had not in those days been carried, for we find that even High Church clergymen used to grow rampant. It is a curious fact, as showing the vicissitudes of the Anglican mind when on its road out of Anglicanism into Catholicity, that Mr. William Palmer, the well-known would-be apostle of the union of the Greek and Anglican Churches, attacked Dr. Wiseman for some statements about Anglican history which he considered to be disrespectful to the Anglican theory. A short time afterwards Mr. Palmer met Dr. Wiseman in Rome, and fraternized with him as a true Catholic. And certainly mention ought to be made of Mr. Palmer in any treatment of the transition-period of English literature; for Mr. Palmer's essays on Early Christian Symbolism were very useful in instructing English friends and foes. We might also consistently speak of such a man as Mr. Welby Pugin, when writing on the transition-period in Catholic literature, for it is more than probable that his "Sermons in Stones" did a good deal towards re-educating the national mind in the idea of the primitive beauty of church architecture. "Æstheticism" was not to be despised as a stepping-stone out of three centuries of ecclesiastical barbarism, the idea of primitive beauty in things material being harmonious with that of primitive beauty in truth.

A third period of the Catholic literary revival may be said to be that of the ripeness of the Oxford Movement, when Dr. Newman shook the foundations of High Churchism by "going over" to the very Church which it repudiated. And at this point it may be interesting to note what had been the increase or the decrease in the number of English Catholics since the Reformation; for the number of Catholics in any country must necessarily affect Catholic literature, not so much because many Catholics mean many writers, as because few Catholics mean few readers, few book buyers. England finally fell in 1570, when the Rule of Deposition by Pope Pius V. obliged Queen Elizabeth to "declare her colors." There were at that time 250 Catholic priests. Within sixty-five years the number had doubled, owing to the thickening of the ranks of the Seminarists and the heroism of the missionaries from "beyond the seas." When we get down to 1746 we find the number of English priests to be fewer, while the Catholic laity were said to be 50,635; and at the beginning of the present century it does not appear that English Catholics could be numbered

at more than about seventy thousand. In 1841 they were 800,000. An attempt at numbering Catholics in 1888 resulted in the somewhat surprising discovery that they might be put down at 1,354,000; so that the proportionate increase of the English Catholic population might be said to have been relatively satisfactory; though, to speak plainly, had less money been expended on noble architecture and more money on the living instruments of conversion, the advance ought to have been considerably greater. Still, if in 1841 there were only 800,000 Catholics, the addition of 554,000 in thirty-seven years is not wholly without (numerical) consolation. The truth is that about \$25,000,000 dollars have been spent on architecture in the last thirty or forty years; splendid colleges have been built for the few; exquisite works of art have been presented to churches; but, as a well-known English priest has recently observed, there ought to be now four million English Catholics, if material fabrics had been less lavishly erected, and the "*corpus mysticum et morale*" had been more cherished. And at this point it may be added that Father Werner, of the Roman province of the Society of Jesus, not long since put down the Catholic population of Great Britain and Ireland as being, at least proximately, as follows: Ireland, 3,815,000; England, 1,439,831 (slightly more than the English census made it in 1888); Scotland, 342,000; total for Great Britain and Ireland, 5,596,831.

The enormous majority of eminent Catholic writers since the period of Catholic Emancipation have been religious or secular priests. Unfortunately, no record has been kept either of the titles or the authorship of Catholic books; at least, not in such form as would enable us to trace proportionate progress from the year 1829 to 1891. It was not until Dr. Newman became a Catholic that English Catholic literature became a power. The reason is perhaps not far to reach. Before that national surprise—that national stirring of dry bones—Catholic writings had been mainly apologetic. Henceforth they became didactic, even aggressive. They who had been for three centuries on the defensive now accepted the nation's challenge to literary combat. And, happily, the new champion of Catholic rights was the exact man for both the Catholics and the Protestants. Gentle, yet powerful; unobtrusive, yet vigilant; a typical and proverbial lover of precise truth, yet exquisitely considerate for others' beliefs, Dr. Newman was the sort of man whom men of all sides would have selected to represent the highest tone of their ideas. He gave the keynote to English Catholic literature, which for forty years has been temperate yet unflinching, both defensive and aggressive in good taste. More than this, he created a new Anglican literature, in

the sense that he invited a friendly reconsideration. What have been called "Catholic books by non-Catholics" were, in great measure, a fruit of that truth-loving peaceableness which the spirit of Dr. Newman's writings seemed to commend. Not a few Anglican writers have published criticisms on the Reformation—on controverted historical and doctrinal points—which have opened the eyes of their brother Anglicans to the perfectly new possibility that Protestant "History" may have been a conspiracy against the truth. It was "Newman's example" which initiated this disillusioning. The school of Dr. Littledale—the school of intensely Protestant Ritualists—has been very small in number and in literary influence, compared with the school of Dr. F. G. Lee, which has sought to emulate Dr. Newman in reading history without wearing Protestant spectacles. A large variety of Anglican works have been so honest, so "good-hearted," that any Catholic may thoroughly approve and enjoy them, while any Anglican may get nearer the truth by reading them. Before the conversion of Dr. Newman it was perfectly natural that such Anglican magnates as Dr. Pusey, Dr. Wilberforce, Dr. Jacobson should shrink instinctively from recognition of Catholic claims. They were men who "taught" before the days when the fortress of traditional bigotry had been carried by storm through the quiet "submission" of scores of the clergy; before the days when Ritualism had developed a craving for Catholic symbols, or Liberalism had developed indifference to truth and error. After "Newman" began to write as a Catholic, Anglican literature caught his spirit of magnanimity; so that it is not too much to say that the great majority of Anglican books during the period of the last twenty or thirty years have been tempered by a quiet esteem for that Catholic ancestry from whom the whole of Anglican orthodoxy has been borrowed. While even as to the good tone of such Anglican writers as treat rather of antiquarianism than of mediævalism—men who strive to prove the credibility of the Mosaic record, or, indeed, that of the whole of the Old Testament—how excellent in disposition as in purpose are the writings of such an eminent philologist as Professor Sayce, whose "Witness of the Ancient Monuments to the Old Testament Scriptures" is a gem of scholarly accuracy and sound inference. All England is under obligation to this high school of laborious students, who cut the ground from under the feet of the scoffers, and who succeed so well that no one attempts to answer them.

If we were to be asked: "What writers would you think of, principally, as having won over the English mind to Catholic sympathies; not speaking for the moment of Cardinals Newman and Manning, whose princely rank has possibly gained for them a

wider hearing?" might we not say that Father Faber led the way, and that Mr. Allies, Canon Oakley, Fathers Formby, Morris, Coleridge, Bridgett, Harper, and Dr. Ward come in the front rank; though certainly Faber will be thought "*primus into pares*." Father Faber was perhaps the most popular writer of his day, because he was both poet and theologian, a man of personal winningness and a great preacher. He seemed to meet society, all society, on its own terms; for he appealed to the purest sentiments of human nature, and was equally domestic and ascetic in his writings. As his great friend, Father Watts Russell, said of him, "power and sweetness combine to make Faber an apostle, equally to the educated and the uneducated." He seemed to "fit into," the sensitive period in which he lived. His books were heart-songs, flowing from intense faith. And never was his theology called in question, though he made theology the very strings of his Catholic harp. How different was the tone of Canon Oakley, so severe, so scholarly, so reliable. And then to speak of Mr. Allies—what a great work he has done—forty years of historic research, with immense results. His last work, the "*Formation of Christendom*," is a noble effort; a worthy finish to a Catholic career which began with tracing (was it in 1849?) the unbroken claim of the See of St. Peter to supremacy. Few writers have worked more with a single object than has Mr. Allies, "*The Throne of the Fisherman*" being always his starting-point, or rather the point to which he led up through long researches. True, "each man to his own place"; nor can any man command more than a range of admirers; and it is a happy thing that the grave historian, the lucid expositor, the brilliant essayist, does not eclipse the value of the man of science nor even of the satirist, provided the good fruits of their just contention be demonstrated. Some Catholics will put down the volumes of Mr. Allies or of Father Faber, and will take up those of Mr. W. S. Lilly or Mr. St. George Mivart, because there is more diversion in a clash of arms where the combatants are well matched, or where the weapons are chiefly pointed by natural reason. "*A century of revolutions*" will enable Mr. Lilly to instruct us on "the four great factors of civilization as it exists in the world, liberty, religion, science and art;" or a treatise "*on right and wrong*" will give Mr. Lilly the opportunity of proving Mr. Huxley and Mr. Spencer to be materialists, and then proceeding to attack their positions with some such introductory reflection as "the great objection to modern scientists is, exactly, that they are so unscientific." While Mr. St. George Mivart will equally delight a class of readers who appreciate a guide who thoroughly knows what he is talking about, who always seems to enjoy his chosen subject, and who can compress into a few pages (witness his

"Catechism for Beginners") more mental food than most writers can get into a big book. In this year, 1891, English Catholics want to be informed, briefly, how agnosticism and a number of other fine conceits can be properly and adequately answered in a few minutes; how common sense can suffice to knock them to pieces, as it were, colloquially, and without the long, laborious process of deep reasoning. Mr. Mivart is just the man to do this admirably. "Nature and Thought" showed his fitness to guide others; and his little "Catechism" is certainly a boon to more than "beginners," for it compasses the whole domain of common sense. There would be no fear of the sophisms of modern skeptics doing harm either to the young or to the old, if all were provided with this little armory of sound reasoning which is condensed into Mr. Mivart's little catechism.

Of men who are so associated with their own time that to speak of them is to recall an epoch in history, Dr. Ward seems to be all one with the Oxford Movement, so that to name him is like going back forty years. His writings are still interesting, and his whole life is still interesting, because they made inquiry and aspiration primary duties. Modern Ritualism is no more like ancient Tractarianism, of which Ward was a pillar and an ornament, than a *mis en scene* is like analysis or synthesis. Ritualism is the settling down into acquiescence with the appearances—the "clothes," as Mr. Wilford Ward calls them, of a semi-catholicism; Tractarianism was the groping the way out of contentious Protestantism towards the oldest, and therefore the purest, forms of truth. This is why the name of Ward, like that of many other early converts, is so honorable, so historic, so didactic; and this is why his numerous writings—indeed, we may say also his Oxford life—claim a front place in the formation of modern literature; because, like Cardinals Newman and Manning, having come out of the thick wood, Ward knew what he had left, what he had found. In this short essay we are not reviewing Catholic books, but only recalling a few of the chief men who have written them; and a string of names occurs to us from whom it seems unfair to make choice, because each one was meritorious in his way. Some great books are necessarily doomed to be short lived, because they only affect to treat of matters up to date. T. W. Marshall's "Christian Missions" was one of these, yet it appears to have stimulated the energies of those whose foibles it showed up, so that they have multiplied the visible fruits of their labors. Yet even ephemeral publications may have great merit, and may do a good which is unseen, untraceable; for who shall say that such playful ventures as the "Life of a Prig," or "The Process of Canonization in the Church of England," may not have opened the eyes of some men while

making them smile; just as "Loss and Gain," which combined gravity with play, may have touched the chords of men who had a keen sense of humor? Perhaps one of the happiest graces of the great Newman was that ("Loss and Gain" only excepted—and this he began to write in a railway carriage for his diversion) he almost totally suppressed his natural vein of irony, which all the world knew he could cut with as with a scimitar. And Cardinal Manning, too, has a natural vein of irony (what great mind was ever totally devoid of it?), which he never indulges save in the society of his friends, and then only in the spirit of pleasantry. This allusion to his Eminence suggests this remark: that his writings have won the favor of the English people (1) by their practical, their thoroughly common-sense bearing, and (2) by their scholarliness of tone, style, and calm. True, only a portion of the Cardinal's (doctrinal) writings has found its way into Anglican drawing-rooms or libraries, yet the English people are naturally disposed to think believingly of an ecclesiastic who shows his faith by his works, by his philanthropy. From a literary point of view Cardinal Manning holds front place as a writer of pure English and simple sense, nor has any Protestant combatant ever attempted to break a lance with him on his distinctively Catholic ground as a truth-teacher. In the old days of Cardinal Wiseman it was a common thing for Protestant critics to try to pull to pieces the Cardinal's teachings; no such antagonism has been ventured upon with Cardinal Manning, and this not only because the English have begun to understand Catholic teaching, but because the Cardinal understands the English mind. Nor is there any living Englishman who, on the subject of education, or on that of the rights of the working-classes and of the poor, has shown a greater mastery of facts or principles, or has written so convincingly about both. "A man of his time," a wide-hearted originator, a severe worker for the temporal good of the greater number, his writings are all as practical as is his conduct, and both are those of a Catholic and a "true Liberal." Politics with Cardinal Manning are the natural science of active good. His Irish sympathies are not political, they are beneficent; his propagandism of total abstinence, like his diligent working for poor schools, has the stern practical motive of pure Liberalism. There would be no English Radicalism, in the modern sense of discontent, if all English gentlemen would act, speak and write with the pure Liberalism of the great Catholic ecclesiastic, whose lucid pamphlets have had much influence with English legislators as well as with the best writers on the press.

And such success may be called a development of Catholic literature in the right direction of a potent influence on legislation.

Another influence—and one that has worked on the national mind—is the disillusioning of the imagination in regard to the so-called Reformation—of the imagination, which had been bound to do the whole duty of the reason, because the reason knew not facts, knew not principles. That conspiracy against the truth called Protestant History has been unmasked by a score of modern Catholic historians. “Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries,” “The English Martyrs under Henry VIII.,” “The Life of the Blessed John Fisher,” Father Bridgett’s “Life and Writings of the Blessed Thomas More,” or Father Morris’s “St. Thomas Beckett,” and other Lives, like Mr. T. Orleban Payne’s “Old English Catholic Missions,” or Canon Estcourt’s and Mr. Payne’s “Records of the English Catholics of 1715,” with the various “Records” and “Registers” which have been recently published, have all been reviewed by the leading journalists of Great Britain, and, as a rule, with a generous admission of their truth.

The old idea, that the Reformation was primarily motived by saintliness, by a passionate longing to purge the Church of its superstitions, and to get rid of lazy monks and the sale of indulgences, has given place to the recognition of the now-demonstrated fact that—as Cardinal Manning has expressed it—“the depravity of the marrying monarch, Henry VIII.,” was the real beginning, middle and end of all “Suppression;” and that by the penal laws of Queen Elizabeth, who could only reign by becoming apostate, Catholic England was forced to profess itself to be Protestant, while all the while loathing and ridiculing the imposture. We are mainly indebted for this “conversion” to literary development. When Mr. Lucas first started the *Tablet* as a Catholic newspaper, the English mind regarded the Reformers as heaven-sent. The English mind now apprehends the truism, that robbery, torture, confiscation, fines, imprisonments and outlawry were the sole apostles of the most wicked outrage known in history—that is, as committed by Christian princes. Catholic literature must have made real progress in the last half-century to have worked such a national “conversion” as this.

And so, too, just to allude to another groove, quite distinct yet naturally parallel with the historic: how real must have been the development of Catholic literary influence, when such writers as Mr. Luke Rivington and Mr. W. F. H. King—both converts of comparatively recent date—can force the admission from the majority of their old allies that they have lost nothing, and may have gained something, by their change. Fifty years ago they would have been regarded as under a delusion; thirty years ago they would have been called perverts, not converts; but the eccentricities of the new Ritualism have led most Englishmen to reflect

gravely that the real cannot be less worthy than the sham. And so it has come to pass that we find the books of convert-clergymen on the tables of a good many earnest Anglicans, who are not prepared, perhaps, to go quite so far as submission, but who rather envy the courage of those who can attain to it. As to doctrinal works, expository works by born Catholics, their success has been in some instances remarkable. Father MacLaughlin's little book, "Is One Religion as good as Another?" is continually getting out of print through the popular demand; and perhaps the secret of this success is the good taste, the refined sentiment, with which the author probes the fallacies of all indifferentism. "*Plura persuasione quam vi*," is a good motto for every Christian controversialist.

To the religious orders in England, perhaps chiefly to the Jesuits, belongs the praise of having produced the best "spiritual" books, as well as the best doctrinal treatises. Yet the credit of having translated a large number of "foreign" works is due equally to laity and to clergy. And here it may be remarked that there is a great want of an English society for the diffusion of non-English literature; and there is also an equal want of a grand book-shop in a London thoroughfare, where all Catholic books could be cheaply purchased by the middle classes, and where public attention could be boldly called to their existence. It is not too much to say, that the "general public" have no knowledge of even the existence of the Catholic writings of their fellow-countrymen; while as to the splendid productions of French, Spanish, Italian and German Catholics, not even the titles of any such books reach the multitude, still less a synopsis of their contents. What a grand work it would be for a few Catholic capitalists to form a society for the reproduction of "foreign" works; to have branches for redistribution in all great towns; not caring to make profit out of the speculation, but only to sell the books at cost price to the multitude. The "Catholic Truth Society" and "St. Anselm's Society" have done a great work; but they have no command over the National Protestant press. Moreover, all Catholic societies in England have this chronic difficulty to contend with; a want of social union, of Catholic combination, of a free and generous spirit of brotherhood. In England the Nonconformist congregations have a sort of freemasonry of mutual aid; among Catholics the social barriers destroy harmony. The world gets in the way of Catholic fellowship. Mammon-worship has its votaries among good Catholics. It is as true of Catholics as of non-Catholics—to quote the words of Cardinal Gibbons—that "the rich are daily becoming richer, the poor poorer; luxury, high living, and the pride of life are on the increase. The thirst for wealth becomes more insatiable; the

cries of the distressed more sharp, and loud, and poignant." The rich Catholics in England go with the stream; they allow conventionalism to crush out their better natures; they will not coalesce in a Catholic spirit, in such way as to make Catholic interests their sole object. There is no such thing, for example, as an English Catholic quarterly review; and the reason is, that private, personal considerations outweigh the larger interests of Catholicity. Human nature keeps the field against progress. And though there is vast outlay, as has been said, in material structures, there is no generalship of the Catholic forces for national conquest, in initiatory, financial, social or literary sense.

This dark side does not lessen the meritoriousness of the individuals who have developed, if not created, Catholic literature. With the certainty of only a "small sale" for their productions—about one-third of what might be looked for in the United States—there is little encouragement to devote years to severe labor; indeed, few Catholics have either the time or the funds. Then, again, that preference for "general literature," which is manifested by the wealthier class of English Catholics, throws cold water on the energies of those Catholics who would be willing to work much if they were read much. An illustration of this Catholic preference for non-Catholic products is found in the fact that there is no Catholic daily newspaper; yet such an organ would be a great help to Catholic writers, because it would bring their products before the eyes of the whole world. Is it likely that the *Standard* or the *Daily Telegraph* is going to devote a couple of columns to a new book by a "Roman" Catholic for no better reason than that it is an exposition of Catholic truths, or a knock-down blow to old Protestant prejudices? If even an Encyclical by the Supreme Pontiff is only just so far alluded to as may serve the purpose of its being made to favor party interests, what hope is there for the Jesuit Father who demolishes some fond Protestant tradition, or for the Catholic layman who is disrespectful to Elizabethanism? The Catholic "weeklies" go only into Catholic grooves. Nay, it is true, also, that Irish newspapers, like Irish books, are but little read on the English side of St. George's channel. Numerous volumes of great merit by Irish Catholics have been published in the last quarter of a century. Ask for them at the English circulating libraries, and you are told that there is little demand for them. Yet it would be easy to name a score of modern Irish books, historical, political, polemical, which are not only worth reading by every Englishman, but which it is every Englishman's duty to read. Groove is the insular English failing; nor does the average Catholic indulge the habit of buying, or so much as reading, Irish works of even acknowledged literary

merit. The same is true in regard to Irish newspapers. It is the rarest thing in London to see a copy of an Irish Catholic newspaper on the library table of even a Liberal English Catholic; while as to the English Catholic anti-Home Rulers, they regard such journalism as poisonous, and would put the *Nation* or even the *Irish Catholic* into their stoves. Now it is obvious that, in these days, Catholic literature and Catholic journalism ought to be mutually auxiliary and sympathetic; journalism ought to assist literature as to publicity, just as literature enlarges the sphere of newspaper usefulness. English Catholics do not feel this, not as a community. They have no objection to subscribing to the *Tablet* or to the *Catholic Times*, but they will not help Ireland by helping its newspapers, nor help England by starting a first-class daily paper. Political bias is a fatal deterrent to Catholic energy. Perfectly united in religion, there is no community in England which is more divided by politics than are Catholics; while, socially, there is no community which is more divided and subdivided, more enslaved by the feeble canons of conventionalism. Literature necessarily suffers by such failings; for freedom is the very atmosphere of the literary spirit, which, like a bird's spirit, only takes securely to the ground, because it knows that its natural movement is on the wing. A few rival Catholic newspapers, however admirably conducted, cannot succeed in either uniting the Catholic community or in opposing a united front to the enemy. Rivalry is not wanted, but one action. Cliqueism is the national blot on a Catholicity whose worst foes are those of its own conventional household.

It has been calculated that only one-fifteenth part of the world's literature is Christian. Now, if we sub-divide that fifteenth part by sectarianism (in England there are said to be 242 sects, and in the United States 144), what a very small proportion of Christian literature can be motivated by the prime idea of Catholic union! All the more reason why, among Catholics, there should be one heart and one mind, not only on points of faith (that is a matter of course) but on the ways and means of advancing Catholic literature, with a sole view to the conversion of the whole world. Private enterprise will not do this. Private book-shops will not do this. A warm if amiable rivalry of Catholic newspapers will not compact the literary hosts for literary combat. Individualism must be utterly sunk in Catholicity. Sectarianism in belief is the Goliath of Gath; David's stone will be no use without the sling, and the sling must be directed by one will.

RELIGION OF THE ANCIENT EGYPTIANS.

Religion und Mythologie der Alten Ägypter, nach den Denkmälern bearbeitet, von Heinrich Brugsch. Leipzig. J. C. Hinrich. Erste Hälfte, 1885. Zweite Hälfte, 1888.

Ägypten einst und jetzt, von Dr. Friederich Kayser. 2te Auflage. Freiburg im Breisgau. Herder. 1889. (Popular.)

History of Herodotus. By George Rawlinson, M.A. Appleton's. New York. 1889. Vol. ii.

OF late years much has been written about Egypt. The happy finding of the key to its stone archives by François Champolion in the beginning of the present century, has opened up to the world a vast storehouse of information. For more than one thousand years the Egyptian hieroglyphics had been a sealed book even to the Egyptians themselves. Now, that learned men are busy reading the thousand monuments still extant, busy delving among the ruins of ancient cities and temples, to discover new monuments and new inscriptions, Egypt's ancient history is becoming better known to-day than it was, even in the days of the Ptolemies,—better known to the present age than the history of either ancient Greece or Rome, whose antiquity is modern compared to that of Egypt. The Egyptians were the oldest of all civilized nations. It is somewhat remarkable, and certainly a noteworthy fact that the *earliest* manifestations we have of Egyptian culture are all in connection with religion. Almost every one of the Egyptian monuments was erected in honor of the Divinity—temples, as places of worship and of sacrifice,—columns and statues, to commemorate some religious event,—pyramids and rock-hewn caverns, to preserve intact the mummified bodies for their future reunion with the soul. The large pyramids, where the mummies of the kings that built them rested, were nothing more than huge tombs; these, with the massive Sphinx guarding the sun Osiris's approach from the nether world—are the oldest Egyptian monuments. It was said that the Egyptian cared little for his earthly habitation, which he called a mere "*dwelling-place*," but he spared neither expense nor labor to make the "*home*" which his body was to inhabit after death strong and durable. Excepting the temples and tombs, there are no other monuments worthy of mention—in fact, none other to mention, for these were the only permanent structures, the only ones that could withstand the gnawing tooth of time, the ravages of fully four thousand years. The great ruins of the once mighty *Thebes*,

with its one hundred gates, are all temples or burying-places; and *Memphis*, the more ancient capital of Lower Egypt, has left us nothing but a few fragmentary pillars and statues which formerly graced the entrance to the temple of Amon-Ra. Not a trace of palace or residence! The pride of the Egyptian centred in his house of worship and magnificent tombs. No wonder, then, that *Herodotus*, after years of residence among them, should arrive at the conclusion that "the Egyptians are more religious than any other race of men." To the pleasure-loving Greek, they were religious *to excess*.¹

By reason, then, of the multitude of monuments, and their countless inscriptions, all bearing on the subject of divine cult, we are enabled to-day to gather sufficient data for a tolerably accurate account of the religious beliefs and practices of the first of civilized nations. Before the hieroglyphics were deciphered, the only knowledge had of the Egyptian religion was that handed down to us by Greek and Christian writers; but a judgment founded on this testimony alone would do the Egyptians injustice, because these writers flourished only in the last dynasties, when the Egyptian religion, together with all Egyptian culture, was in its decline. The religion of the Ptolemies differed materially from that of the ancient Pharaohs, just as did their temples and monuments. The nature of the ancient worship can be learned only from the fountain-source—from the records of the old Egyptians themselves. Reading these records, students of Egyptian history have differed widely in their interpretation of the primitive form of the Egyptian worship. The later German Egyptologists, among whom is *Brugsch*, incline to the view that the religion of the Egyptians was *pantheistic* in its origin. They affect to believe that it differed in nothing from the primitive nature-worship of the Hindoos and Chinese. *Nun* or *Nunet*, or as sometimes written, *Nutr*, *Nutar*, *Nu*, *Nu-t*, the primordial ocean, containing in germ all the forces of nature, was the first and highest divinity of the Egyptians. This they compare with *Tian* of the Chinese. But they seem to overlook the fact that *Nun* of the Egyptians was a personal god, as the inscriptions discovered plainly indicate. *Nutr*, the active principle of the primary creation, now still creating all things anew—creating the light each morning, and vegetation in each recurring spring, restoring within stated periods youth and strength to decaying nature, begot all things out of himself. He is the generator, and at the same time the substance out of which all things are generated; father, mother, and child, all in one. This *Nutr*, who is one with *Nu* or *Nun*, is addressed as a spirit, as the

¹ *Herodotus*, p. 52.

one living God. The very earliest references acknowledge him a *Supreme* and *Personal Being*, the *One* and *Only God*. *Maspero* found such mention as early as the *fifth*, and even the *second* dynasty.

Other Egyptologists maintain the *polytheistic* character of the primitive Egyptian religion. Such is, for example, *Maspero*, who at first defended the monotheistic view, but later found reason to change his belief. Such are, also, *Wiedemann*, *Pietschmann*, *Edw. Mayer*, *Ermann*, *Strauss*, *Perrot*, and *Chipiez*. According to these, the Egyptians ascended from polytheism to the belief in one, supreme God by dint of wise speculation. *Le Page Renouf* holds that both polytheism and monotheism existed side by side from the very beginning. *Rawlinson*, with *Lenormant* the noted orientalist, believe in an esoteric monotheism and exoteric polytheism. Other savants again, equally versed in Egyptian lore, strenuously contend for a primitive monotheism, among whom may be noted *Pierret*, *de Rouge*, *Wilkinson*, *Kayser*, and I am happy to state *Dr. Henry Hyvernat*, of the Catholic University, the best authority in America on the religion of the Egyptians. The latter bring to their support a number of solid arguments. As already said, the earliest manifestations we have of Egyptian belief show faith in a Supreme, Personal Being. On the oldest monuments we perceive references to God couched in what might properly be styled Christian language. He is designated as the "One, Personal, Uncreated God," the "Creator of heaven and earth," "Who is the Past, the Present, and the Future," the "great God Eternal, existing before the heavens and earth and water were," "the Conservator of all created things," "Who hears the prayers of men," "Who grants to man his daily bread," "Rewards the obedient and punishes the disobedient," "Who defends the weak against the strong," "Who exists by Himself;" etc.¹ These appellations and references are such as any Christian might make use of. They are identical in fact with some of the petitions of our ordinary prayers.

Their ideas of God's attributes were likewise sublime and exalted. We read, for instance, that "God is a *Spirit*," "a hidden Spirit," "the Spirit of Spirits," "the great Spirit of Egypt," "the divine Spirit"; "God is from the *beginning*, He existed from all time"; "He is the first beginning, and existed before anything else was, and He created what now is after He himself was;" "He is the Father of all beginnings." Again, "God is *eternal* and without end;" "ever present, and ever existing;" "He has existed from eternity and will exist for all future ages." "God is *invisible*

¹ Kayser, p. 27.

and no one has yet known His appearance ; " " No one has discovered His likeness ; " " He is hidden from gods and men alike ; " " He is a mystery to his creatures ; " " no man knows what appellation to give Him ; " " His name remains a secret," " a secret to his children." Behold here a striking resemblance between Egyptian and Jewish customs. Neither did the Jews dare to designate God by His true name, and in consequence the name itself has become lost. Our *Jehovah* may or may not be the proper characterization of the vowelless יהוה.¹

Perhaps in no other appellation have the Egyptians shown a loftier conception of the divine excellence than when they designate God as *Truth* : " who lives in and nourishes Himself by truth " ; " who is the king of truth and looseth the tongue of all truth " ; " who is founded on truth and the creator of truth." All truth in the world is from God. A lofty conception indeed for a people untaught by divine revelation. Again, it is said, " God is *life*, and we live only through Him " ; " God is being " ; " the *constancy* of all [mutable] things " ; " the constant One who multiplies Himself without losing His identity " ; " the *One* who multiplies Himself a millionfold." " That which His heart desires is instantly encompassed ; and when He has spoken, His words are accomplished, and will endure for all eternity." This reminds us of the story of creation as told in the inspired pages of the Jewish law-giver : " God said, ' Let there be light,' and there was light." The omnipotence of the Egyptian God is hardly less sublime than that of the God of Israel. Divine mercy and justice were also duly acknowledged and honored by the ancient Egyptians. " God is merciful," it is said, " towards those that reverence Him." " He hears those that cry to Him " ; " defends the weak against the strong " ; " hears the prayers of those that are cast into bonds " ; " He is merciful towards those that call upon Him " ; " defends the fearful against the arrogant, and judges between the mighty and the poor." " God recognizes them that profess Him, rewards those that serve Him, and defends them that follow Him " ² What definition can

¹ The ancient Hebrews employed only consonants in their writing, the reader supplying the vowels himself. Later, when Hebrew ceased to be a living language, learned Jewish scholars—from the sixth to the ninth century after Christ—styled *Masorites*, from their great work, *Masora* (meaning tradition), affixed vowel points above and below the consonants in order to insure a correct reading. Such, however, was the reverence paid to the divine name, that though always written it was never pronounced. Under the consonants of this word—the word given in modern Bibles as *Jehovah*—the *Masorites* placed the vowels of the word " *Adonai*," meaning Lord, which was always read in place of the proper name of God. So, by disuse, the former word became lost, and in spite of their investigations for the last fifteen hundred years, Hebrew scholars have not yet been able to determine its true punctuation or vocalization.

² Brugsch, part i., p. 96, ff.

express God's infinity better than that attributed to *Thoth*, the Hermes of the Egyptians: "God is a circle, whose centre is everywhere and its circumference nowhere."

These selections, which are but few of the many found in the inscriptions of the monuments and in the papyrus rolls of the tombs, show beyond doubt that the Egyptians had a knowledge of the One Supreme God,—a knowledge, in fact, scarcely inferior to that of the Jews, if we could rest our judgment solely on the testimony quoted above. Unfortunately, however, the very pages on which these have been written make allusion to other gods, showing that though the Egyptians professed belief in a Supreme Being, they nevertheless worshiped also a plurality of gods. Such contradictions are of common occurrence, and what is stranger still, the Egyptians did not appear to consider them contradictions,—a fact very significant, and not a little mysterious. After all, there may be an explanation to this; they may, in reality, not be contradictions at all. Egyptologists have not yet been able to solve this difficulty. Some have asserted that the inferior gods were but representations of the divine attributes, but other names for God's various perfections. Though this may have been the earlier practice, it is plain that before long their vicarious character was lost sight of, and they were adored as independent gods. True, the knowledge of the unity of God was preserved in priestly circles throughout all time; it was fostered by them in secret, but the bulk of the people, who were purposely kept in ignorance, drifted away farther and farther from their first ideal, until they hesitated not to pay divine homage even to the lowest of brute animals. Why was the knowledge of God's unity confined to the priestly caste alone? Why did priests refuse to impart their own higher knowledge, their own exalted belief, to the populace? Why did they rather countenance, aye, and openly encourage, the grossest form of animal worship? These are questions that have not yet found a satisfactory answer. Perhaps the priests thought to mystify an untutored laity by a show of mystery in order to dominate over them with greater security.

Animal worship was not the primitive form of the Egyptian cult,—so much is certain. Its introduction dates from historic times; according to *Manetho*, the learned Egyptian historian, from the second dynasty. In this early stage animals were looked upon as mere representations of the various powers of the divinity. This also goes to prove that the first form of Egyptian worship was a pure monotheism. It is not conceivable that religion should have been at its lowest when civilization was at its highest; and it is in the old kingdom—from the first to the fifth dynasty—that

the Egyptians found their golden age. From this time on everything began to decline, and with art and civilization also religion. If we call in the book of Genesis to witness, the theory of primitive monotheism becomes still more probable; for according to that account the Egyptians were descendants of Noah, if *Mizraim* (the Hebrew name of Egypt), the son of Cham, Noah's third son, be considered the father of the Egyptians, as is commonly held. It is admitted by all that the early Egyptians, who were kin to the Canaanites and Arcadians, migrated from Asia, coming through the territory now crossed by the Suez Canal, and that they settled on the fruitful shores of the Nile. The oldest cities lie to the north, where *On* or *Memphis*, the first capital, is situated, not far distant from the present capital, Cairo. From the north emigration drifted *southward*, not, as was formerly believed, from the south *northward*. They were not, as might perhaps be supposed, of negro extraction. They were Caucasians, as we are, though considerably darker. In their general appearance they differed perhaps little from their present descendants, the *Copts* and *Fellahs*, who have preserved their individuality and racial distinction under many centuries of Arab rule and Arab oppression. If this view of the descent of the Egyptians be true, we have good reason to believe that their primitive religion was monotheistic in character; for Noah possessed a knowledge of the true God, and it is but natural to suppose that this knowledge was handed down to his posterity, among whom, of course, the primitive revelation must have become obscured in the lapse of time, and mixed with much that would necessarily detract from its original purity.

Viewing the religion of the Egyptians as presented on their monuments and transmitted to us in their own writings, let us see if we can construct from it a system of theology as we have it in the Jewish and Christian religions. Some sort of system may be evolved, but it remains at best a very imperfect one, and future discoveries may force us to change even this. Even partial studies, however, warrant the belief that the more we learn of the Egyptian religion the more we will find to admire, the more perfect, pure, and exalted it will become. The difficulty of throwing this theology into some sort of form arises partly from the contradictions that we constantly meet with in their belief and practice; the belief of the priests and the belief of the people; partly from the inextricable confusion among the gods themselves. Only few of the deities were worshiped throughout the length and breadth of the land. Each district and city had its particular God, to whom was accorded a special worship. Such were, for instance, *Amon-Ra* at Thebes, *Phtha* at Heliopolis, the *Crocodile* at the Fayum, the *Bull* at Memphis, and *cats* and the goddess *Bast* at

Bubastis. Most gods and goddesses were worshiped under various names and under various representations in the different nomes or districts, which adds still further to the confusion.

The chief god of the Egyptians, as already indicated, was *Nu* or *Nutr*, meaning *might* or *power*, or, according to Brugsch, "*the active force of nature*," thus fitting in with his pantheistic theory. God revealed Himself to the Hebrews under a similar name, that of אֵל שַׁרְי, God Almighty: "And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying: I am the Lord that appeared to Abraham, to Isaac and to Jacob by the name of God Almighty, and my name, Adonai (put for the proper name), I did not show them."¹ This god was self-created. The "Book of Funerals," their greatest religious work, calls him the great Primordial Ocean, in which floated confusedly all the germs of life. From eternity God begot Himself in the bosom of these shapeless waters. The references quoted above on the unity and perfections of God were addressed to this deity. We have some very beautiful hymns relating to the same. Here is a specimen, the original of which is preserved in the museum of Bulacq, Cairo: "Lord of wisdom, whose precepts are wise. . . . Lord of mercy, whose love is without limit. . . . Lord of life, of health and of strength. . . . Thou the One, the Only [God], who givest food to the birds that fly in the air. . . . Who preservest all things. Hail Thee because of all these benefits. . . . Who alone wakest when man sleepeth, in order to seek out the good of thy creatures. . . . Adoration to Thee, who hast created us! Greetings to Thee from every clime. Creator of all things we adore Thy spirit. . . . Thou the sole one incomparable, sovereign King!"² This idea of the Godhead was too abstruse, too far removed from the conception of the multitude; it would do for the educated class,—the priestly caste,—but the uneducated, who constituted the bulk of the nation, must have something that will appeal directly to their senses, they must have a *visible* representation of the deity. So it came that the *sun* was worshiped, not at first as a deity itself, but as a representation of the deity. In time, however, it lost its representative character, and people came to pay it honor in its own right, worshiping it under the name of *Ra*. Almost every pagan nation has had a special veneration for the bright orb of day, which indeed is not to be wondered at when we consider the mighty influence it exerts upon our terrestrial well-being. A writer of note, Max Mueller, has declared that no form of nature worship can be so readily excused as the worship of the sun. That the sun was held originally as distinct from God by the Egyptians, is proven from one of their

¹ Ex., 6, 2 and 3.

² Kayser, p. 28.

hymns, which gives a naïve and extremely beautiful description of its creation. "In the beginning God bade the sun come to Him. The sun came, and as soon as it entered into His presence *began to shine*." When *Ra* later threw off his allegiance to old God *Nu*, and set up his own throne in the bright blue ether, he succeeded in bringing under his gentle sway all the humbler classes of Egyptian worshippers.

Ra, the sun-god, and the first of the solar cycle of gods, was pictured in Egyptian writings as a bark riding on the celestial waters, not as a golden chariot drawn by fiery horses, as ancient Greeks and Romans imagined. The moon and stars and planets were looked upon as assistant gods, each adding his quota to the manning and safe guidance of the boat. This God is addressed in one of the hymns thus: "O thou Lord of gods! Chnum-Ra, thou king of the North and of the South, ruler of provinces; Shining Splendor that floodeth the earth with light; whose right eye is the disk of the sun, and his left eye the moon, whose spirit is the ray of light, and from whose nostrils proceedeth the north-wind."¹ Ra rises in the east, and with his two mighty weapons; *light* and *heat*, drives darkness and cold before him, to the great delight of his faithful worshippers. When he has arrived at the west, where the waters of the firmament rush down to the infernal worlds through the crevice of the mountains near Abydos, the bark disappears from view, and the people piously believe that he has gone to the lower regions to comfort the souls of the just whom death has gathered into the realms of Osiris. These different phases of the sun have each received special honors, and in time people came to look upon the rising, midday and setting sun as so many deities. The disk of the sun—also called God's eye—was honored as the god *Aten*. The sun as a vivifier was called *Khopra*. *Amon*, the chief god of Thebes, and *Phtha*, of Memphis, were also solar gods. The three principal solar goddesses were *Sckhet*, *Bast*, with the face of a cat, and *Mout*. Connected with these were *Aah*, the moon, with his companions, *Khonsu* and *Thoth*, the latter corresponding to the Greek Hermes, the messenger and secretary of the gods. *Isis* was identified with the fixed star Sirius.

The second class or group of gods were those identified with the creation of the world. The Egyptians believed in the eternity of matter; that the world was co-existent with God Himself; but that in the beginning it existed as chaos, a confused mass. Out of this, the so-called "Primordial Ocean," God evolved the present orderly universe. He separated the waters of the firmament; the clouds from the waters of the earth, which He confined within its

¹ Brugsch, pt. i., p. 195.

banks, and supported the sky on an immense arched vault. There was a higher and lower atmosphere, all of which, together with the river Nile, were worshipped under various names, and each as a distinct god. There is a striking resemblance between their idea of creation and that as given by Moses. There is a still further resemblance in this that the Egyptians imagined God as the creator of *all* men,—the only nation, with the exception of the Jewish (whose knowledge was derived from direct revelation), that acknowledged that others besides themselves, their enemies not excluded, were created by the same God. Brugsch sums up the teachings of the Egyptians on the cosmogony in these words: "In the beginning there was neither heaven nor earth; surrounded by impenetrable darkness, the *All* pervaded the limitless, primordial waters, which concealed in their bosom the male and female germs, or the beginning of the future world. The divine Spirit of Spirits, inseparable from the primitive waters, felt a longing for creative action, and by his word the world was awakened to life,—that world whose form and variegated beauty were pictured before in his eyes. After their existence the physical outlines and colors answered the truth, that is, the primitive concepts of the Divine Spirit's future work. The first creative act began with the formation of an egg out of the primordial waters, from which evolved the light of day (Ra), the immediate cause of life in the world. In the rising sun has become embodied, in its most luminous form, the omnipotence of the Divine Spirit."¹

Because the same general idea of a creation or evolution out of primitive waters or out of a chaotic morass prevails among all nations, Brugsch concludes that the human mind, when left to its own resources, will naturally figure to itself a creation similar to the one described; but the believing Christian will detect in this universal tradition, obscured though it be, the deposit of faith handed down to his posterity by the father of all men; he will accept this as additional evidence of the common descent of the entire human family. There was a tradition among the Egyptians concerning the disobedience of our first parents, and, what is still more striking, the serpent was looked upon as the incarnation of god Ra's worst enemy, the demon of darkness. Plutarch says that the serpent Apopis was brother to the Sun-god, and was hurled from his high place because he wanted to make himself like unto him; in which we may detect a possible reference to the fall of Lucifer. Curious to say, all memory of the deluge was blotted from the minds of the Egyptians, though it has lived in the tales of almost every other nation, being found even among the abo-

¹ Pt. i., p. 101.

iginal inhabitants of Mexico. Yet, after all, this circumstance admits of an explanation. The only flood the Egyptians had actual experience of was that of the Nile, which yearly overflows its banks; but with this they could associate nothing of evil, for the overflow of the Nile was the cause of the extraordinary fruitfulness of its valley,—that which made Egypt, under an enlightened government, the granary of the world. So the idea of a destructive flood must soon have passed from their minds.¹ At Edfu, on one of the walls of the famous temple of the sun, the following poetical description of the creation is found. A beautiful child, with the sun's disk resting upon his head, is represented sitting on the open petals of a lotos flower, which swims on the surface of the water, and underneath are inscribed these words: "*He opens his eyes and the world becomes light, and night is parted from day. The gods issue forth from his mouth, and man from his eyes, and all things are made through him. When he arises luminous out of the bud of the lotus, all beings exist in their entirety.*"²

A third set of gods were those that presided over the destinies of the future world. The Egyptians believed in the immortality of the soul; their psychology, however, is very complex and somewhat contradictory. The body they called *Khat*, and to the intelligence, which is a spirit, they gave the name of *Khu*, meaning luminous. This spirit is independent of the body, and can move whither it wills; but since it is igneous and would destroy the body, *Khu* is enclosed in an envelope, also of a divine nature, but less subtle than the *Khu*, and is called the *Ba*. The *Ba* closely resembles our soul, but does not permeate or inform the whole body; it is confined to one particular part of the body, though which part we are unable to learn, and from here it animates every organ of the body by means of the *Nifu* or "breaths." Now, the *Nifu* also has its envelope, called the *Ka*, which is an exact duplicate of the body. Animals differ from man in not enjoying the *Khu*. The *Khu* is a spark of the divinity and essentially good, which nothing can defile. The *Khat*, on the other hand, is necessarily bad. The soul, *Ba*, however, is possessed of free will, and may elect fellowship with the *Khu* or with the *Khat*, and its future life will be accordingly either happy or unhappy.³ After death, or rather after the funeral, the soul appears at *Amenti*, the place of trial, accompanied by *Anubis*, son of the goddess *Nephtys*. The judge is *Osiris*, the most popular of Egyptian gods, who is in reality none other than *Ra* in his character of King of Hades, some-

¹ Kayser, p. 40, 41.

² Brugsch, pt. i., p. 104.

³ Dr. Hyvernât, *Lectures on Egypt*.

times also called *Osiris-Ra* or *Soul of the Sun*. His sister and wife, *Isis*, equally as famous as her brother-husband, is associated with him in the dread court, as is also *Nephthys*, her sister, and her son *Horus*. Anubis takes the heart of his deceased companion and places it in the scales of justice. Thoth, the recording angel, if I may so call him, keeps account of the process, with a dog-faced ape at his side. *Mat*, goddess of justice, holds the scales; her eyes are bandaged as a mark of impartiality. Forty-two other deities stand guard, all intent that strict justice shall be meted out. The dead is asked to give account of his terrestrial stewardship, which he does somewhat after this fashion: "I have never told a lie; have never been cruel to man or beast; never blasphemed God," etc., answering to forty-two different questions, all of the virtues being of a negative character. If the virtuous outweigh the sinful acts, the heart is found of sufficient weight, and, in consequence, the soul is adjudged good. It now enters upon a series of long and hazardous peregrinations in the lower world, made in company with the god *Horus*, until it finally reaches the bark of *Ra*, there to find, in *Aahlu*, supreme and never-ending happiness. If the heart were found too light, it is thrust out and forced to enter the body of some unclean or wild animal, and at the second death, when it again presents itself in the lower world, it will be devoured by the hideous, crocodile-headed monster, *Harpechrot*, and become totally annihilated. We see from this that they believed in the transmigration of souls, a doctrine adopted from them by Pythagoras and the Greeks. The souls of the just became united again with their original bodies before they entered into the realms of everlasting bliss. For those that had been guilty of lesser sins there was a place of purification,—a purgatorial fire,—where they were cleansed prior to their admission into Elysium; but they knew no hell of infinite duration, "whose fires are unquenchable, and where the worm of conscience never dieth." The wicked were punished for a time, and then totally annihilated.

Something more now about *Osiris* and *Isis*, the favorite deities of both the classes and the masses. They were worshiped throughout the kingdom, from the beautiful Island of *Philæ* in the south to the seven mouths of the Nile in the north. *Osiris* was, to the Egyptians, something akin to what Christ is to the Christians. According to an ancient tale, he descended from heaven to teach men truth and make them happy. He became as one of their own, living among them as their king and instructor. Under him, Egypt became Eden. But the serpent of jealousy, *Set*, brought in evil; and the garden of pleasure, like the story of their creation, lives now only in the tales of their stone tablets. *Set*, who secretly coveted the power and influence of his distinguished

brother, resolved to make way with him, and after his assassination assume himself the reins of government. To this end he prepared a banquet for the king, and in the midst of the festivities slew him. The corpse was cut into fourteen pieces, placed in a chest and floated down the Nile. It happened that the chest was washed ashore within the confines of Phœnicia, and strange to relate, a huge tree grew up at the spot and completely enveloped the chest within its ample trunk; and, strangest of all, grew up to adult size in the course of a single night. The king of Phœnicia, surprised at such miraculous growth, and charmed with the massive size of the tree, had it cut down and framed into a column for the hall of his palace. Disconsolate Isis, who had been wearily seeking the lost body, received secret information that her husband was shut up within the famous Phœnician column. She immediately presented herself at the royal court, and succeeded in having herself appointed nurse to the king's young son. At night, when all was quiet, the story goes on to say, Isis would change herself into a bird and flutter around the enchanted column and warble her sweetest songs to her imprisoned lord. When the time came for her to quit the service of the king, she would accept of no compensation but the magic column, which the king kindly granted her. Isis immediately liberated the entombed fourteen pieces of body, sorted them out in the form of a man, and cared for them so tenderly and lovingly that Osiris was forced to return to life. Their son, *Horus*, later, avenged the father by putting Set to the sword, after which he installed Osiris in his quondam sovereignty.

This curious fable antedates Grecian influences by at least two thousand years, according to *Le Page Renouf*. It is not a mere fable, but an allegorical tale, representing the conflict between day and night—day is vanquished in the death of Osiris, but triumphs again in his resurrection. The religion of the Egyptians, different from that of the Greeks and Romans, is not founded on fable or purely mythical history.¹ Osiris is further represented as one of a trinity, or rather of a *triad*: Isis, his wife-sister, who is one with himself; and Horus, their son, who is one with both father and mother, are the other members. There are three persons, though all three form but one nature. Almost every one of the gods is a member of such a triad; the triad being again, in some cases, the third member of an *enneade*, or trinity of triads. The principal cities had their special triads, as Phtha, Sekhet, and Ra, at Memphis; Amon, Mout, and Khonsu, at Thebes, etc. Of the later great triad, Amon was the husband of his mother; Mout, his wife,

¹ *The Ancient Egyptians*. J. G. Wilkinson. Ed. 1883. Vol. ii., p. 500.

was the mother of her father, and the daughter of her son ; while Khonsu, the son of Amon, was the father of his father. Understand this who can. To determine their exact degree of kin might be somewhat difficult. The Egyptians escaped the difficulty by saying the *three* were *one*. Some of the Egyptian triads were without the female element, corresponding in this respect to the great trinity of the Hindoos, Brahma, Vishnu, and Shiva. Vishnu, the saviour, bears a striking resemblance to Osiris, the god-man of the Egyptians. These triads, of course, bear but a very remote resemblance to the Blessed Trinity ; the points of agreement being only apparent.

In later years, one of the kings of the seventeenth dynasty, *Amenhotep IV.*, or *Chuenaten*, introduced a new divinity into the Egyptian pantheon—the god *Aten*. He tried to make the worship of this deity universal, and so bring about a uniformity in religious offices, and bring Egypt back to its primitive monotheism. In this he was unsuccessful. *Aten*, some think, was none other than the Adonai or Lord of the Jews. The Phrygian *Attin* offers us a more probable derivation, but then *Attin* and *Adonis* of the Syrians, as Wilkinson remarks, was the Adonai of the Bible. *Amenhotep's* mother was from Asia Minor, probably a Syrian ; from her he likely learned of the new god.¹ At *Tel el Amarna*, he had the following beautiful prayer cut into the rock : “ Mortals honor Him who has created them, and pray to Him who formed them. Thou, O God ! who art, in truth, the Living One, Thou art He who builds what ne’er was before, and formest all that is. We were also called into existence by the word of Thy mouth . . . There is no God but Thee. Vouchsafe to Thy son, who loves Thee, life in truth, that he may be united with Thee for all eternity.”²

As to the worship of animals, we may again say that animals were at first meant only to represent God and His divine attributes ; gradually, however, *many* of them began to assume the character of real gods in the Egyptian ceremonial. The Egyptians were loth to invest statues of wood or stone with divine honors ; they thought inanimate objects unworthy to serve as a dwelling-place of the divinity. That accounts for the absence of idols. The Jews were less particular ; when they could not find a calf in the desert to adore, in imitation of an Egyptian custom—the worship of Hathor—they made themselves a calf of their gold ornaments. The most popular of the sacred animals of Egypt was the bull Hapi or Apis, of Memphis, supposed to be the second life of Phtha. Herodotus says he was known by certain marks ; his hair was black ; on his forehead was a white triangular spot ; on his

¹ Renouf, in Kayser, p. 36.

² Wilkinson, vol. iii., page 352, note.

back an eagle; a beetle under his tongue; and the hair of his tail was double.¹ Some of these marks were visible only to the priests, which accounts for the fact that the temple of Memphis was never without an occupant, for, if some of the marks failed, as they certainly always did, the priests could fraudulently assert that they were visible to themselves. Pilgrimages were made from all parts of Egypt to pay honor to this strange deity. Hapi was kept in a magnificent palace; he rested upon a couch of down at night, and in his waking hours stretched his portly body on beautifully woven oriental rugs. He was fed with the daintiest food, and waited upon by an army of obsequious priests. However, Hapi was not allowed to live this way forever; his term of life, unfortunately, was fixed by law; he was not permitted to survive twenty-five years. At the expiration of the allotted time he was conducted in solemn procession to a sacred pond near the temple, and with all the solemnity due such an important ceremony he was given his final, fatal bath. When life was extinct, his body was drawn out, embalmed with costly spices, and what was mortal of Hapi was buried with all the processional grandeur that his exalted dignity called for, amidst the profound lamentations of his grieved devotees. The body was entombed in a magnificent sarcophagus, placed in a spacious underground temple—the *Scrapis*—and the soul of Apis went to the happy hunting-grounds of Osiris-Ra.

Another animal held in high esteem through the whole of Egypt was the insignificant beetle, the scarab. It was not a representation of Phtha, a deity itself, as was Hapi, but merely a sacred animal, the *symbol* of Phtha. It is found engraven on signet-rings and on every species of ornament. Miss A. Edwards, an Egyptian scholar (who gave a series of interesting lectures in this country last year), in a recent work thus enthusiastically dilates on this little emblem of divinity: "Whilst watching the movements of this creature, its untiring energy, its extraordinary muscular strength, its business-like devotion to the matter in hand, one sees how subtle a lesson the old Egyptian moralists had presented to them for contemplation, and with how fine a combination of wisdom and poetry they regarded this little black scarab as an emblem of the creative and preserving power, perhaps even of the immortality of the soul. As a type, no insect has ever had so much greatness thrust upon it. . . . Its image was multiplied a million-fold, sculptured over the portals of temples, fitted to the shoulders of a god, engraved on gems, moulded in pottery, painted on sarcophagi and the walls of tombs, worn by the living and buried with the dead."²

¹ Herodotus, p. 353.

² *A Thousand Miles up the Nile*, p. 96.

Other sacred animals were the jackal, asp, cow, hawk, ibis, goose, etc. Thousands of mummified cats have lately been taken from the ruins of Bubastis, where to kill a cat formerly meant certain death to the offender. In the Fayum, which, in ancient times, was the entrance to the great reservoir of Moeris, the titular god was the *Crocodile*. Strabo, a writer of antiquity, acquaints us with a curious custom practiced at the Fayum whenever a pilgrim came to pay his respects to one of these amphibian gods. It was prescribed that each visitor make an offering of cakes, fried fish, and a beverage prepared with honey. When the customary gifts were presented, three priests at once proceeded to offer, or rather administer, them to the sleepy god, who usually lay stretched out on the shores of a small lake, lazily sunning his iron-clad back, and perhaps resting one of his jewelled ears on arms encased in finely-wrought bracelets of gold. The crocodile evidently knew not how to appreciate the frequent offerings, for two priests had to pry open his jaws while the other thrust down the cakes and fish and gave him his drink of honey. After such an operation the god would invariably take to the water and make for the opposite shore. If, in the meantime, another visitor chanced to present his offerings, the priests would walk around to the god's new resting-place and make the unhappy deity submit to a new gorging on cake and fish, and so *ad indefinitum*.

This, then, represents the dogmatic teachings of Egyptian theology. If its tenets are somewhat confused, that arises from the contradictory statements of the documents themselves, for these have been gathered from many sections of country differing from each other in their different beliefs, and represent a development—not always uniform—of thousands of years. There is less confusion regarding their *moral* precepts; all are agreed that these are of an exceptionally high order. As already said, they believed in the immortality of the soul and in future reward and punishment. This was not without its influence upon their practical life. All laid great store also by the public funeral they were to receive after death, but these funeral rites were denied those that had not led an exemplary life, and there are several instances on record of religious sepulture having been denied even to kings. This fear of the people's judgment after death was a potent factor in making princes and others mindful of the rights of their subordinates.

Obedience was the fundamental virtue of Egyptian morality; obedience towards God, towards parents, and towards the king was constantly inculcated. Thus we read: "To obey is to love God; to disobey is to hate Him." "The son will become happy through obedience; in this wise he will win divine favor." "The obedience of a son to his father is a cause of joy. He is loved by

his father, and his praise is in the mouth of the living who walk on the earth." "Give not thy mother cause to complain of thee, lest perchance she lift up her hand to the divinity and He give ear to her wail." And to the parent it is said: "Bring up thy son so that he will love God." Herodotus tells us that the Egyptians paid great deference to their parents and to elderly people in general. It was considered a breach of etiquette to remain sitting when an older person entered the room. On the streets the younger always made way for them.¹ Patience, meekness, purity, temperance and charity were also strongly inculcated. It was said, for example: "Piety to the gods is the highest virtue." "Beware of injuring thy neighbor by thy words." "Do not gossip, for gossip will make its round." Even the ancient Egyptians had experienced this. Still more practical was the advice: "Do not reveal thy thoughts to him who has an evil tongue." Again it is said: "Be not given to many words; observe silence, that will prove to your benefit. Let not thy voice be heard in the temple of God, for He abominates this." "Love truth" was another maxim of theirs, and "Isis will bless all the gifts that God has given thee."

The Egyptians believed in early marriage; therefore the anxious parent counselled his son to marry early. "Marry a *young* woman, thy son will do the same after thy example." Unlike the other nations of the East, they allowed their wives great freedom, and were exceptionally kind to them. "Be not rude with thy wife at home when thou knowest that all is right with her. Do not say, 'where is this?' 'bring me that!' for she has put it in its proper place." Again: "If you are a wise man fix your house pleasantly; love your wife; do not quarrel with her; give her food and jewels because these make her comely; give her perfumes and pleasures during your life; she is a treasure, which must be worthy of its owner."² This was, perhaps, some sage priest's advice to a young and inexperienced bridegroom. Diodorus tells us that they went still further in their deference to the fair sex,—for *fair* it must have been when even as early as that ladies used dyes and cosmetics. "Wives," he says, "ruled their husbands, and in the marriage contracts husbands had to promise due obedience to their spouses." This, of course, was carrying things a little too far.

Some of the above are taken from the maxims of *Pthahhotep*, son of one of the early Egyptian Pharaohs; his papyrus, in fact, is the earliest extant. His conception of moral law was far superior to that of any Greek or Roman philosopher. *Humility* was a virtue unknown to the classic nations; nay, there was not even a

¹ Herodotus, p. 113.

² Hyvernat, *Lectures on Egypt*, p. 107.

word in their languages to express it. Yet the ancient Egyptian threatens the proud man when he says: "Let not any one proudly exalt himself; for God, who has given him strength, will humble him." Again he says: "When you have become great after being lowly, and when you have gathered riches after being in want, and when you have become the first of the town . . . do not grow elated over the wealth that you have accumulated, because the author of your bounty is God. Do not place others beneath you, because what you have become may likewise be in store for them."¹ The Egyptians were an industrious people, and hated idleness above all things. Vagrancy was severely punished. Herodotus says there was a law compelling every Egyptian to appear before a court of justice once a year and give an account of how he employed his time. If it was found that he was not making an honest living, he was, without further ceremony, condemned to death.² This was before the age of tramps and Italian troubadours. The moral teachings of the Egyptians were pure and noble, and more exalted than those of any other nation of antiquity with the exception of God's chosen people, the Jews. Brugsch says they were not inferior even to Christian teachings; but this certainly is not true; no religion, no system of doctrines, either of the past or present, can be compared to the moral code of Christianity. If the Egyptians were taught to love their fellow-men, Christians are commanded to love and do good even to their *enemies*. Christianity forbids even the bare thought or desire of evil; her motives are not earthly advancement, earthly happiness; they transcend nature, they are spiritual, supernatural. There is an infinite distance between even the highest of pagan religions and the religion of Christ.

The *ceremonial* of the Egyptians was in keeping with the grandeur of their temples, and these were the finest and most numerous of all antiquity. *Karnak*,³ in Thebes, is the ruin of the greatest temple ever built by man, just as the pyramid of *Chufu*⁴ is the largest tomb. There was a large body of priests connected with

¹ P. 227.

² Draco inserted this law into his Athenian code.

³ The temple of Karnak was 1200 feet long and 340 feet wide, covering an area of 396,000 square feet, which is more than half again as much as St. Peter's, Rome, covers. Ferguson calls this "the noblest of architectural magnificence ever produced by the hand of man." Rawlinson, *History of Ancient Egypt*, vol. i., pp. 230, 237 ff.

⁴ The largest pyramid of the Gizeh field, Chufu or Keops, contains 89,000,000 square feet of solid masonry, weighing 6,848,000 tons. Some of its basement stones are 30 feet long and 5 feet high, and all the stone was quarried at Syene, 500 miles distant. Though mortar was not used, the stones fit together so closely that not even a needle can be wedged in between them. No settlement in any part of the huge pyramids can be detected. It is the greatest triumph of mechanical architecture. Cf. Rawlinson, vol. i., pp. 204, 205.

the temples, and the priesthood constituted the highest class in the state. To them was intrusted the education of the royal princes, and the direction even of the kings themselves. They anointed the latter, and placed the sceptre in their hands, just as Christian bishops did to the emperors and kings of Europe in the Middle Ages. As already said, they were well educated, while all the other classes were literally steeped in ignorance. Wise men from all countries wended their way to Egypt to receive instruction from her sages. Egyptian priests were the teachers of Solon, Pythagoras, Herodotus, Democritus, Plato, and many other eminent Greeks. They employed all their ingenuity to devise means for making the religious ceremonies impressive. Every month of the year and every day of the month were devoted to some particular god or goddess, just as our days and months are devoted each to a special saint or mystery. Rawlinson says religious or semi-religious ceremonies seemed to know no end, and to occupy almost incessantly the main attention of the people.¹ Their whole life, customs, and manners were permeated with religion. The month of May was devoted to Isis. Her statues were decked with flowers, and processions were formed in her honor. Processions were a common feature of their ceremonial; sometimes even statues covered with baldachins were carried with pompous display from one shrine to another; tapers were burned, litanies recited, banners were carried, and the processions were accompanied by clean-shaven priests vested in fine linen albs and beautiful copes of leopard skins. There were festivals without number, for the greater of which priests prepared by long and rigorous fasts. Sacrifices were offered of animals, but, as far as is known, never of human beings, be this said to their honor. Pilgrimages to some favorite shrine were also of frequent occurrence.

On one of the outer doors of the temple of Edfu may be read the following exhortation addressed to the clergy entering the edifice: "Let any one that enters through this portal beware that he enter it not in uncleanness, because God loves purity more than the millions of the rich, and more than hundred thousands of gold pieces. He finds his contentment in truth; through her He is comforted; and he finds His great joy in perfect purity."² Symbolical of the purity that should be his distinguishing mark, the priests, as Herodotus tells us, were required to bathe four times a day, and to shave themselves—the entire head and body—every second day. The faithful and the priests were circumcised, and that long before the time of Abraham; though it remains uncertain whether circumcision was, with them, a religious rite.³ Cir-

¹ Vol. i., p. 322.

² Brugsch, pt. i., p. 92.

³ Herodotus, p. 53.

cumcision obtained in Egypt as early as twenty-four hundred years before Christ ; however, it was not confined to the Egyptians alone, being practised among many nations of antiquity, as it is still practised among some barbarian tribes at the present time. It was the practice of the ancient Ethiopians, of the Toltecs of Central America, and is still a custom among the natives of Australia, and other Oceanic islands ; the custom, as well, of all orthodox Mussulmen, and even of the Christians of Abyssinia, with which country Egypt has ever stood in close relation.¹

The *funeral* ceremonies of the Egyptians are highly interesting. At the death of a member, the whole family fell into deepest mourning. The men allowed their beards and the hair of their heads to grow, and both men and women vested themselves in long white shrouds, sprinkled their heads with dust, and besmeared face and robe with mud. They went about the streets uttering their lamentations, and were soon joined by a throng of wailing relatives. Women were specially hired to pray and lament for the dead ; and this was kept up for many weeks. The corpse was embalmed or mummified in the Egyptians' peculiar way,² which process lasted some seventy days, after which the body lay in state for another week or two, when the solemn interment usually took place. The procession to the tomb was a most imposing affair. The coffin was carried on a chariot, or on a sort of sleigh, resembling a bark, in imitation of the one on which Ra was supposed to make his daily trip around the world. Arrived at the tomb—which was usually a very beautiful building, for the tombs of the Egyptians were among the finest structures of the country, rivaling in magnificence even the great temples themselves—the coffin was placed upright, and offerings were made by each member of the procession, consisting of cakes, fruits, etc., while a priest muttered prayers into the ear of the mummy, and cautioned him against the dangers that he might encounter in his travels through the nether world. Then the coffin was placed in a sarcophagus, together with a copy of the famous “Book of the Dead,” a pair of shoes, a staff, jewels, small statues of gods and men who were supposed to be of some assistance to the dead in his future wanderings ; an emblem of the deceased's profession, as a pair of scissors for a tailor, etc. Into the sarcophagi of children they placed a few toys—to amuse them in the life beyond. The sarcophagus was then sealed and lowered into a secret crypt, which was then filled up with rocks and carefully walled over, so that the exact spot might remain a secret. They were very careful to pre-

¹ Cf. Geikie, *Hours with the Bible*, vol. i., ch. xx., p. 265. (Alden, 1886.)

² For full description of process, see Herodotus, pp. 118, ff.

serve the body intact, because they thought their future happiness depended upon a second union of body and soul. This will also explain the mummifying process—a process intended to protect the body against decay. In the mortuary chamber, above the grave, bed, and furniture, and food were stored for use of the dead; and, at frequent intervals, friends and relatives met in this chamber to offer prayers for the deceased. The large pyramids were built to serve as tombs by some of the more powerful kings. The great pyramid of Chufu, the highest and most massive structure in the world, contained room for only one, or, at the highest, two sarcophagi. The entrance to this central room was so skillfully hidden that during thousands of years men searched for it in vain. At Thebes, kings and nobles hollowed out their palatial tombs in the native rock of adjacent mountains. The entrance to one of these is graced with four statues, each sixty feet high. The interior is finely sculptured, and the walls still tell their hieroglyphic tales.

One of the curious customs of the Egyptians was the peculiar honor they paid to those domestic pets, cats and dogs. When a cat died, all the members of the household fell into mourning, and as a sign of their grief shaved off their eyebrows; when a dog died, the whole head, as Herodotus tells us, was shaven clean.¹ This was done because they were inclined to look upon them as more than ordinary beings. Aside from a few such silly customs, we must say that the religious rites of the Egyptians were such as to give them a high place in the scale of civilization. These religious rites were not without their influence on the Egyptian people. They were, in general, moral, and calculated to influence for good.² They made the Egyptians what they were—the most devout people on earth. Only two or three festivals were attended with excesses, chiefly those of Memphis and Sais, where immorality and drunkenness, for the time being, ran riot. The Egyptians were, in general, a moral race, though Herodotus complains that the women were immodest in dress. Excepting this, there was little to find fault with. They did not practise polygamy, and in this they differed from almost every other nation of antiquity, not excepting even the Jews. Women held about the same position in Egyptian society as they do in our own. They were not shut up in seraglios. The Egyptian women often came together for gossip, and to drink tea, though it sometimes happened, as the visiting

¹ P. 97.

² Thus illustrating the remark of Max Mueller: "Whether we descend to the lowest roots of our intellectual growth, or ascend to the loftiest heights of modern speculation, everywhere we find religion as a power that conquers, and conquers even those who think that they have conquered it."—*Origin of Religion* (Ed. 1882), p. 5.

Greeks ungallantly disclosed to the outside world, that they took something stronger, and had to be helped home by their slaves;¹ As a people, the Egyptians were grave, yet withal contented and happy; they were provident and industrious; hospitable and kind; loyal to their rulers; mindful of their departed friends in prayers and sacrifices; and what constitutes the crown of their glory, *zealous for the interests of their imperishable souls, and profoundly magnanimous in their service to the Highest.* Such was the first and grandest nation of all antiquity.

THE TWO SICILIES AND THE CAMORRA.

THOUGH Northern and Southern Italy, by force of arms and by political methods eminently Macchiavellian, have been unified for thirty years, there are Northern Italians who do not esteem, as brethren should, their Neapolitan or Sicilian countrymen. And facts have proven and do prove, that even with such masterly politicians as Crispi and Rudini at the helm, there are Neapolitans and Sicilians who would, willingly, be no more Italian than their fathers. Why the northerner should deem himself more worthy than the southern man of bearing a proud title, is not easy to understand. Neither intellectually, nor morally, nor physically is the southron inferior to the northerner. Before Lombard or Tuscan had a tongue, the Sicilian gave a spoken language to Italy, and the vernacular was known, not as Italian, but as Sicilian. From the list of Italy's great and good men, blot out the names of Neapolitan and Sicilian, and how blurred and dull the once bright page will be. Had there been no St. Thomas there never could have been a Dante. Perhaps the southron's blood is of a less pure strain. Let the northerner separate and count the mixtures blended in his veins. In love of virtue, law, or liberty, the southerner holds no second place. The history of Naples, as of Sicily, is a record of glory and of trial, splendid and terrible by turns. The North has its tale of wickedness, of shame. The good men of the South have been silent. Well might they complain. If they are silent, it is only because they value patient effort rather than vain recrimination. Time works wonders.

¹ Wilkinson, vol. iii., pp. 392, 393, with some curious illustrations.

The attempt to belittle the Sicilian and the Neapolitan may be traced back, for a quarter of a century at least, to the interested supporters of the Piedmontese government. The southerner has been painted as an exceptionally uncivilized Italian; and native as well as barbarian writers have presented the Maffia and the Camorra as types of two peoples who, though by courtesy received into the Kingdom of Italy, are really peoples apart, characterized by manners and morals foreign to the altogether lovely nature of the truly Italian Piedmontese, Lombard, Tuscan, Venetian, and Romagnese. One of the missions committed to Piedmont was, evidently, that of lifting the populations of Naples and of Sicily up to the high plane of exemplary, sweet morality, of which North Italy, in this century, as in the sixteenth and in the twelfth, has been a model, shining though not unique. If we are to trust official reports of recent date, neither Sicilian nor Neapolitan have been notably influenced by the unselfish efforts of the Northern political missionaries, and Maffia and Camorra, despising unappreciative writers of newspapers and of books, are still respected institutions in the South. Nor has the whole power of the government, now seated in Rome, been strong enough to compel all Sicilians and Neapolitans to submit to the King's law, based on noble principles looking only to the common weal, and to shake off the rule of criminal societies, whose principles are no worse than those of the successful Italian politicians of the last fifty years. A sketch of the history of the Two Sicilies, and of the Camorra, may aid those in search of the truth about the unification of Italy, and those who take interest in the development of civilization within our nineteenth century.

The meaning of the word Maffia, Sicilians can no more exactly define than the Neapolitans can define "Camorra." To Sicily the Maffia is confined; but the Camorra flourishes not alone in the city of Naples, as many imagine. Over the Abruzzi, the Terra di Lavoro, Puglia, the Basilicata and Calabria, its baneful power extends. In many of the islands along the coast, and in Sicily, the Camorra is active; and though the name may not have been adopted in the Romagna, organizations having like ends and using similar methods existed there not many years back, and also in Venice and in other parts of North Italy.

Associations of criminals are not unknown in the United States. Every large city has its "gangs." These, however, are vulgar associations, which no political party, no senator or cabinet officer would, even secretly, negotiate with and much less protect. Following the example of their unconvicted fellow-countrymen, who, secretly combined, so often abetted, in the convenient guise of politicians, the most frightful crimes, French criminals have long had

an organization. But among the Italians, if we may trust the testimony of Italians, the secret society has been more scientifically adapted to ends openly criminal than among other European peoples. And the Camorra, according to Italian authorities, easily holds first place in the annals of Italian associations especially devoted to the encouragement of crime and to the protection of criminals.

How or when the Camorra was first organized, no one can tell. Italian writers would be pleased if they could trace its roots in the East. There the uses of the secret society in attaining bad ends have been appreciated from time immemorial. The Thug is not yet extinct, and telegrams from China prove that the Highbinder is full of virulent vitality. If it could be established that the Arabs or the Spaniards brought the Camorra with them from their barbarous lands, the Italian inquirer would be satisfied. He has found an Arabic word, *Gamara*, which means a gambling-house, and another word, *Kumar*, the name of a gambler's game. Then the Spaniards have a word, *Gamurra*, to signify the dress affected by common bullies. Chroniclers speak of a robber band called *Gamurra*, famed in the thirteenth century; and the Spaniards relate that, in 1417, a certain company, intitled *Garduna*, acted just as the Camorra has acted in our times. The great Cervantes is appealed to. In one of his novels he describes the confraternity of *Monopodio*, which robbed and extorted, far and wide, on the plea of devotion to a shrine. Many of the customs of this confraternity have, it is said, been kept alive by the Camorra. In search of tutors in organized robbery, we must wonder at an Italian's going abroad. Certainly Italian annalists, chroniclers, historians have preserved facts enough to make it evident that before the thirteenth century, as well as since, the generous soil has never failed in producing a plethoric crop of criminals. The free companion was a Camorrist. And what were Gasparone, Mazzini, Garibaldi, Cavour or *Il Galantuomo*? The Camorra is not an association of low-bred thieves. Intelligently, its leaders accommodated themselves to the progressive, "liberal" spirit of the nineteenth century.

Official documents relating to the Spanish rule at Naples during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries frequently refer to criminal organizations that controlled the jails. The *padrone* was a power in the jail then, as now he is a power out of jail. He compelled the prisoners to give him their money, even their clothes, or else to be beaten, poisoned, or stabbed.¹ The Camorra was first discovered in the present century, about the year 1820. Then it was at work in the jails, and the system did not differ from that which

¹ Alongi Giuseppe, *La Camorra*, Torino, 1890, pp. 23-24.

troubled the government during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. There are inquirers who incline to the belief that the Camorra was organized as early as 1790, but the evidence is not substantial. From 1820 until 1859, the society exercised its appointed functions with an art and a force truly surprising. As a political factor, it was not counted upon, however, until the year 1859. Then patriotic and liberal-minded statesmen calculated the possible force of the Camorra as an engine in the secret workshop of revolution and of unifying chicanery. The resolution of the problem was eminently satisfactory for a time. The Camorra grew in numbers rapidly. The rich, the ambitious, the unprincipled of all conditions were enrolled in its ranks. The Piedmontese government played a sharp game; but the Camorra were trained gamblers, and in all games there are at least two hands. In 1862, the winners of 1860 were compelled to try force against the Camorra; and since 1862 there have been many judicial inquiries, many prosecutions, many wholesale convictions. The Camorra is, nevertheless, still playing a strong hand.

"Do not ask for grace; conquer it,"¹ said Mazzini to a young woman who we sincerely hope has not wholly followed his diabolical advice. The motto of Mazzini, we may be certain, was not always followed even by a hardened Camorrist, though born criminals as many of them were, and carefully educated as were all of them, we need expect to hear of none but graceless deeds done in their name. Recently the telegrams from Italy told us of a trial, at Bari, of nigh two hundred men who were professedly members of a "Mala Vita" society. To hear of two hundred men who are so lost to all sense of shame that they deliberately combine in the pursuit of a "wicked life," and who are proud of being called wicked, shocks law-abiding Americans, but equally law-abiding Italians are not so easily shocked. They have had an experience which, it is to be hoped, we shall never pass through. The name "Mala Vita" is new to us, but it is not new in Italy. Every Camorrist takes his degrees; and the first degree he receives—when he has earned it—is that of the "Mala Vita." He has proved himself worthy of being called a man of "wicked life." The number of Mala Vita societies just now, and the thriving state of the membership lists, testify to the fact that the Camorra is struggling for existence amid conditions not wholly unfavorable. Like their Bourbon predecessors, the Piedmontese kings could and would and did banish the religious orders with that expeditiousness which immoral governments, like immoral men, always display when pursuing religion and virtue. But the men profession-

¹ Personal Recollections of Mazzini. *Fortnightly Review*, May, 1891, p. 710.

ally wicked, why should they fear their secret allies? None better than criminals know that the persecutors of good men are the most arrant, the most compulsory cowards. Conquer grace, and you destroy manhood and womanhood.

Should some student of Neapolitan history find the Camorra fully organized as early as 1790, no one who has followed the course of events in the two kingdoms of Naples and Sicily would be surprised. A learned English historian, Mr. Freeman, has promised us a history of Sicily from the beginning. As a record of wars, of royal ambitions quenched in blood, of the endless suffering of generation after generation of God's creatures, the poor and the simple, no sadder one can be conceived. No Englishman, however painstaking, will ever write the true history of either Sicily or Naples; and least of all the history of the last hundred years. When the French Revolution fired all the enemies of faith and of grace, who, the world over, had been logically educated in the revolutionary doctrines, for which, according to Mazzini, the Reformation had prepared the way, Naples and Sicily were quick to act. In Naples alone there were seventy thousand men affiliated with secret political societies. The English were prepared to see the government victorious, or expelled. All they wished was to control a rich country and positions valuable for attack or defence. And the French? They were bearing Liberty southward on a hospital litter. From '89 to '98, if the Sicilians and the Neapolitans were a happy people, it was only because they had learned to take the world easily. To support large armies that peace might be assured at home and the country protected against the foreigner, every class was taxed, and taxed again beyond bearing. However, Ferdinand's task was most trying, and wiser men might have done less well than he did. Against Napoleon he made a bold stand. Out of Rome he drove the French, and had Piedmont shown as much patriotism then as it has practiced trickery since, the whole of Italy might have been freed from the grasp of the invader. As it was, Championnet occupied Naples, after a short campaign, and solemnly declared Saint Januarius a citizen of the Parthenopean Republic!

Before the French came, the jails were filled with conspirators and assassins. Now they were emptied, only to be filled again with "patriots"; for the mass of the people rose up madly against the invaders. In their madness they slaughtered not only the enemy, but also the noble and the learned among their fellow-citizens. To be suspected of a leaning to the foreigner was to be condemned to the dagger. Novelists in search of a thrilling subject might well turn to Naples in 1799. Within a month the unfortunate people suffered greater ills than had been their lot in the

previous twenty-five years. To-day they are fleeing from a country where they are esteemed only as taxable machines and as soldier pawns. Then they could not escape the liberating Frenchmen who robbed them of the very trinkets they delighted in. The churches, convents, monasteries, were rifled, by law, and the money that more than all is the money of the people, consecrated to their uses, was carried into France to sharpen the ploughshares with which the genius, Napoleon, was to cut the throats of so many unfortunate members of the brotherhood of man.

The French had friends in Naples. The men of the secret societies were all ready to take the offices, and to instruct their countrymen how a Republic ought to be governed. Speeches rather than victuals were plentiful. The "democratizator" came in with the French Constitution.¹ He planted trees of Liberty and levied contributions on the people.² Of the fruit of the tree of Liberty, it is the "contribution" that is generally reserved for the dear people. Against kings, against the Pope, the "democratizator" was furious; and yet neither king nor Pope were friendless. The king's friends were not idle, and they were numerous. How could it be otherwise? In a day the institutions of the country had been overturned. The nobility, the officials, the army of the kingdom had been cast out, and new men were busy securing themselves in power by every persecuting means. The discharged soldiery became thieves, brigands, assassins. The old nobility, landholders, officials, directed and supported the patriot guerillas. Then the whole of the Neapolitan territory was turned into a nursery of brigands. As yet Fra Diavolo had not appeared on the operative stage. He was doing the devil's work, was this Michael Pezza, in the Terra di Lavoro. Of many brutes, he was only one. They made a business of assassination. A meal of human flesh they enjoyed. One of them, Mammone, a miller by calling, was proud because he had cut four hundred throats with his own right hand. His table was dressed with the fresh-cut heads, and he preferred human blood to common wine.³ To such a pass was the kingdom of Naples brought by the French sons of Liberty. Hating them the people treated them as they dealt with the people, who finally drove them out savagely. In Sicily the king waited. Nelson lent a willing hand. He was soft-hearted only with an adulterous mistress. The Sicilians furnished their quota of soldiers against the common enemy. Terrible was the

¹ Without any particular office or stipend, these democratizators were charged to persuade or compel cities and towns to adopt republican forms. They were provided with letters-patent from the government. See Colletta, *History of Naples*, vol. i., p. 304. Edinburgh, 1858.

² Cantu, *Hist. des Italiens*, vol. xi., p. 123.

³ Cantu, *loc. cit.*

slaughter. Brother stabbed brother, as if there were no God, no commandment. How Mazzini would have rejoiced could he have generalised such a body of slaughterers—with headquarters in London!

At length the king returned to Naples. Picture the following five years of the country which had passed through this horrible schooling; a disunited people, a land of hates, enmities, disorders, revenges; a land of punishments for disloyalty, of exile, and always of brigandage and assassination. Calculate the losses of men and of property; calculate the misery; you will not calculate the debts and the new taxes. Ferdinand did all that a king could who was so overwhelmed with misfortunes. He had hopes even when the victorious Napoleon threatened him. But after Austerlitz he saw himself forsaken by the English and the Russians. A decree of the victorious emperor, and an army of 50,000 men, sufficed to put king and queen to flight; and the French entered Naples without a battle. Joseph Bonaparte, by the grace of his brother, was king of the two Sicilies. The prisons were again filled. Colonel Fra Diavolo, moved by patriotism still, with Sydney Smith's letters in his pocket, robbed and warred after the guerilla fashion that young Italy revived thirty years later.¹

Between French ideas of liberty and the gibbet there has been an intimate connection. The gibbet was set up in Naples. Had it not been for the gibbet, the jails would have been inhumanly overcrowded. Of course there was room in the jails and on the scaffold for a bishop, for priests, monks and nuns. Could there be a nobler sacrifice offered up on the altar of liberty—French or Italian—than a religious woman? You can see what a loving attachment the "people" must have formed for the new government, and how hard they cursed the Bourbons! How could any one resist the winning, just, magnanimous Bonapartist régime?

Of course the Neapolitans were promptly submitted to the Napoleonic code. To be well governed it was a maxim in France that the world should be governed after the last French fashion. To-day, perhaps, this maxim is not generally received even in France; though there are Frenchmen who still believe it as firmly as many Frenchmen did in 1806. Joseph Bonaparte had received a larger share of grace than his brother, the emperor, or else he had responded more freely to such grace as was granted him. He wished to deal with his people as though they were something more than slaves; but of any like policy the emperor would have none. The kingdom he would have robbed of money and of men, taxing it to the last penny and depriving it of the last able man.

¹ Colletta, *History of Naples*, vol. ii., p. 47.

Soldiers he wanted and means wherewith to pay them. When in 1808, Joseph was deported to Spain, the Neapolitans shed no tears. Murat, who succeeded him, forced a tear and a groan from many a strong heart.

This innkeeper's son carried things with a high hand during the seven years he lorded it over the Neapolitans. Joseph had generously accorded them a Constitution, after his brother had sent him to Spain. Murat abolished this Constitution. He gave the public property as well as the offices to foreigners. The conscription provided him with a large army; none too large however. In Sicily, the Bourbons ruled, and the English could afford to furnish them money and arms. They paid themselves well. After 1811 they were practically the rulers of Sicily. "Military occupation" was the term used to cover a usurpation. English diplomacy has seldom failed for want of convenient terms.

Meantime, Murat wore no crown of roses. In an attempt to occupy Sicily he was worsted. The English harassed his coast line, and, by their secret relations with the Neapolitan brigands, whom they encouraged with money and with Sicilian reinforcements, made his tenure most insecure. The brigands in Puglia, in the Basilicata, in Calabria, were numbered by thousands.¹ Remorselessly they fought in the name of the Bourbons and of the people. Remorsefully they were pursued and punished. The secret societies were active. They were less warlike but more dangerous than the brigands. Murat had helped the Carbonari. In Naples as in Sicily the order was a power. Bentinck threw them a sop with the promise of a Constitution if they declared in favor of the Bourbons. When Napoleon was discrowned, Murat caught at a straw. He had turned against the Carbonari; now he made friends of them. Why should not he be king of Italy? He negotiated with the allies, and then played them false when Napoleon returned from exile. Defeated, Murat preferred a Constitution to the people who were no longer his subjects (May, 1815). The Austrians and the English had taken possession of Naples and Ferdinand I., late Ferdinand IV., was once more nominal ruler of the two kingdoms.

After a quarter of a century of wars, revolutions, foreign occupation, and of contesting kings and influences, we can realize the actual condition of Naples and of Sicily. Once more the "ins" were turned out. Old hates and rivalries were living; to these, new hates, new oppositions were added. English ideas, Napo-

¹ When Joseph Bonaparte assumed the crown, the brigands were so numerous in the kingdom that he saw no other way of dealing with them than to offer a pardon to all malefactors who laid down their arms and swore fealty to the government. —*Colletta, loc. cit.*, pp. 47 and 117, vol. ii.

leonic ideas, Austrian ideas, Muratist ideas, Neapolitan Bourbon ideas, Carbonaro democratic-revolutionary ideas, the passions, the ambitions of all the parties and cliques, were acting, counteracting. What sort of an army must that have been in which the men on whom the crown depended were divided by local jealousies and political hates so recent and so bitter? The brigands took new courage. To the conscription the Neapolitans were not favorable. They preferred to take to the mountains and to rob picturesquely. Conspiracy was in fashion. The Carbonari, by 1819, numbered 600,000. A year later their number was estimated at 800,000. Theoretically king of the Two Sicilies, Ferdinand was in fact only king of the Carbonari. They had him at their mercy. He tried to stamp them out. Into the jails they were flung. They turned the jails into lodges; 1820, by the way, is the very year in which the Camorra shows itself. In the jails we see it fully organized. Later on we shall be better prepared to say whether this was merely a curious coincidence.

A Constitution the Carbonari had determined to have. Sicily had received a Constitution from the English. The king repudiated it; but in part he was compelled to accept it. Thinking men said: Why not have one Constitution for the two kingdoms; but the Carbonari said no. Only the Spanish Constitution would satisfy them. They gathered an army, appointed Pepe as general, took possession of Naples, and proclaimed the Spanish Constitution (July, 1820). There was not a copy of it in the city; but everybody cheered. The king swore to this Constitution. In a kingdom of which the idiots have control, a king may be pardoned for playing the fool occasionally.

Between Naples and Sicily no love has been lost. The Sicilian despised everything Neapolitan. He wished a new Constitution, a Sicilian article. The Sicilian Carbonari were, however, bound to do as their cousins did and demanded the Neapolitan-Spanish Constitution. Civil war ensued, and "the whole island was inundated with blood." A Neapolitan army was proud of the patriotic fury it displayed in subduing the Sicilians.

The story of Ferdinand's experience in the two kingdoms and of the Neapolitan experience of Joseph Bonaparte and of Murat, shows that about this time and in those parts, kings were not mighty potentates. Besides the brigands, the Carbonari, the bureaucracy, and the people, there was at least one other factor with which a Bourbon had to count. The allied powers formed a court by which kings were supremely judged. Ferdinand's Constitution they condemned as inconsistent with absolute kingly rule.

¹ Cantu., *loc. cit.*, vol. xi., p. 308.

The Carbonari kept a close watch on the king. They threatened him and were placated only when he swore a second time to the Constitution. But the powers insisted, and Ferdinand placed himself in their hands. Within less than two months after his second oath, an allied army was in Naples. The Carbonari had taken the field, and had been easily routed. Once more the jails were filled; once more the gibbet was set at work; once more the dagger was freely plied. The old army was discharged, the officers were imprisoned and hired Switzers kept order. To pacify the politicians, separate laws and separate administrations were granted to each of the two countries. No true Sicilian would consent to be governed like a Neapolitan; and the Neapolitan scorned laws and officials good enough for Sicily! If politics were mathematics, how easily great problems in government would be solved!

When Ferdinand died, in January, 1825, he did not, we presume, deeply regret his eternal separation from the Carbonari and the brigands of Naples and Sicily. Thrice within the sixty-five years of his reign he had been dethroned, and thrice he had regained the throne. As kings go, he was a good king. He had to contend with enormous difficulties. Had his title been "President," he could have made more mistakes within four years than he did in sixty-five. No man can fall into mistakes unless opportunity favor him. Between 1821 and 1825 the king had gradually enlarged the liberties of the people, giving them the best government in Italy. The conditions under which he governed may be judged from the statement that in the single year, 1822, eight hundred of his subjects died either by the assassin's or the hangman's hand.¹ Ferdinand's son, Francis, reigned an uneventful reign of five years and was succeeded by his son, Ferdinand II., upon whom the Carbonari of all countries and the designing politicians of England as well as of Piedmont put a mark, by popularizing the name "Bomba." He deserves a better name than Cavour, or Victor Emmanuel, or Louis Philippe, or Louis Napoleon, or than Palmerston—not to mention some other English leaders, now quite popular, who in their day were not too choice about the use of repressive means of government in countries neither Sicilian nor Italian. Under Ferdinand II., the two Sicilies progressed rapidly in all directions, materially, intellectually and even morally. The revolution was at work. Mazzini's emissaries in the cause of Young Italy were in search of brigands, smugglers, the riff-raff of Italy, of men with "muscular arms and hard hearts." There was a breed of such men in the Neapolitan kingdom—bul-

¹ Cantu, *Hist. des Italiens*, vol. xii., p. 84.

² Cantu, *loc. cit.*, vol. xii., p. 111.

locks—and they were readily driven into the herd that the Genoese outcast tempted with the smell of human blood dripping from a shining dagger. From 1828 onward, these thieves and assassins, proudly posing as “political offenders,” carried on a guerilla warfare when and where they might. Nor was Sicily free from similar bands of criminals, who honored themselves with the name of conspirators. As soon as they went beyond limited assassination or robbery, these rascals were pursued with armed force. Too few of them were hung or imprisoned. During the cholera year, 1837, the Sicilians revolted. In Naples, the people believed that the Sicilians had with malice prepense, spread the cholera on the mainland. The Sicilians were certain that the Bourbons had sent into the island professional poisoners who had secretly choleraized the atmosphere. They maltreated and burned more than two hundred men and women suspected of being Bourbon cholera-poisoners. Of these senseless, inhuman crimes, the instigators were men of education. At Catania, there was a revolution. No cholera-poisoners’ Constitution should sully the bright page of Sicilian history. The old English Constitution of 1812 could alone satisfy the mob. Indeed, a considerable clique in Sicily—a clique of professors and of literary men—favored England and kept alive a spirit of hatred of all things Neapolitan. It was not the Bourbon they wished to be rid of. From Naples they would, if possible, be wholly separated. A nation by themselves the Sicilians ought to be, said these suspiciously patriotic writers and orators.

Young Italy gathered in the jail-birds and the uncondemned Carbonari secretly. With the aid of the brigands, in 1847 and again in 1848, an unsuccessful and a successful uprising were organized. The king offered concessions looking to an administration and laws more purely Sicilian. The leaders refused to lay down their arms unless they were granted a parliament which should make a constitution wholly agreeable to them. The king sent a fleet of nine vessels to Palermo, and on the refusal of the leaders to accept any compromise, the fleet bombarded the city. Hence the “Bomba.” Immediately the Neapolitans demanded “reforms.” The Bourbons had always kept the bishops and priests well in hand. Like the common run of kings, the Bourbons were bound to have something under their thumb, and the Church is the one persistent thing. Considering the circumstances, no one will reproach the Neapolitans because they demanded that Ferdinand should change his confessor. If a king may be a Pope, why may not the mob put on a tiara? Among the governments of Italy—to go no further—Ferdinand’s was the most liberal. He did not wish to see bloodshed, were the shedding avoidable. Besides other reforms, asked and unasked, he granted a new con-

stitution. With that profound wisdom that marked all their political action, the Carbonari—Young Italy, if you please—chose a French constitution for the Neapolitans. An intelligent citizen of Naples or of Sicily, whether in 1848 or 1798, must have been kept busy, between reflecting, mourning and laughing. When the French constitution was conceded, the Carbonari filled Italy with cries, not of "Bomba," but of "Long Live Ferdinand!" After Pius IX., he was the "idol" of all the villains who were secretly working, with the most devilish energy, to undo him and the Pope. Of course the timid men, the smart, and the fools, were beating their hands red and sore, applauding. They were so delighted.

Had it been spontaneous, the affection of some Sicilians for the English constitution would have been more than remarkable. The sentiment was manufactured. Palmerston and his agent, Lord Minto, were playing the revolution against the king and the king against the revolution. In Sicily as in Naples, a mob practically controlled the government. The Sicilian mob was confident. Ferdinand's authority it declared at an end, and forthwith a new king was sought for. A friend of true religion and of the people was at hand, Louis Napoleon. Unfortunately for the world he missed the crown of Sicily. At Naples a "liberal" parliament sat, undoing to-day what yesterday it had done. In the streets the slaughter of contending factions was horrible, even in Naples. The king spent his days and nights in granting concessions. To put down the Sicilian insurrection, men and money had to be lavished. The Sicilians fought desperately; and the Neapolitans had no mercy. In Sicily the jails were thrown open, and to the bloody horrors of soldiery and brigands were added the audacious thefts, the heartless assassinations of experienced criminals. Encouraging the king, the English were meantime supplying the Sicilians with arms. After months of murderous fighting the revolution was quelled (May, 1849). Then followed imprisonments, executions and necessary emigrations.

The idol was now made a target of. Calumnies were poured out on him. Notwithstanding wars, insurrections, and all the obstacles placed in his way by wicked or by foolish men, his government deserved praise. Under his careful management the finances had been wonderfully improved, and he had done much to develop the resources of the two restless and jealous nationalities.¹ But he was doomed, and the plotters had agreed on their conscienceless scheme. Abuse cost nothing to the lying crowd of Mazzinians. Falsehood and murder were their trade. Palmerston was the real villain of the play. Ceaseless in the campaign of lying,

¹ See details, Cantu, *Hist. des Italiens*, vol. ii., pp. 359-360.

he used his powerful influence and the varied means at his disposal to make Ferdinand's name a by-word. At the Congress of Paris, where, in company with Napoleon III., he schemed deeply to assure the destruction of the temporal power of the Pope—a scheme since partly realized—he vomited a portion of his bile on the king that had been marked for the sacrifice. Piedmont was at his side. Cavour proved a good second to the English hypocrite and agitator, and adroitly broached his “patriotic” views about the “recasting” of Italy. That blusterer and tool, Mazzini, gave the pass-word: Not books but cartridges! The Australian ballot is our fashionable cry. Should a considerable number of Americans ever reject “the idea of any intermediate source of truth, other than genius united with virtue,” we also shall have leaders in the path of progress, whose motto will be, Not ballots but cartridges—and the dagger. It is neither the soil nor the temperature that breed savagery. Out of the Godless, graceless soul does it spring spontaneously.

Cavour, La Marmora, Piedmont and the revolutionaries lost no time. Naples was almost as important as Rome. When Murat aspired to be king of Italy, he had reason on his side. The population of the Neapolitan kingdom alone represented more than a fourth of all the peoples called Italian. Naples and Sicily together counted more than one-third of Italy. And Piedmont that was conspiring, by all manner of means, to “absorb” the rest of Italy, how great a kingdom might it be? All told, its subjects numbered not more than four million four hundred thousand on the mainland and in Sardinia—not one-half the population of the Two Sicilies. The Neapolitan territory was just twice as large as Piedmont. The two islands were about equal in size, but while in Sicily there were ninety inhabitants to the kilometer, Sardinia could boast of only twenty-four.¹ With these figures before us, we shall the better understand the anxiety of Piedmont to carry sweet liberty into Naples and Sicily, and we shall not misunderstand the abuse voided on the Neapolitan kings and on the southern “people.” The “popular” cry for freedom and unity we can unfailingly trace to its true source, and the instigators of revolution we cannot mistake.

During 1856 and 1857 the Two Sicilies were a prey to the Piedmontese conspirators. Men and vessels were sent to excite insurrection. Palmerston and Louis Napoleon abetted Cavour's criminal policy, and diplomatically sought to make Ferdinand's government impossible. This trio has never been completely judged here below. Some day a man of cool judgment, with human feelings, will brand

¹ See table of Census of 1848-54, and of estimates of 1857, in Cantu, *loc. cit.*, vol. xii., p. 366.

each one of them on the forehead and over the heart. It was not their brain alone that was filled with guile. They corrupted a good part of the world by their bold and far-reaching immorality. Ferdinand II. escaped the weapon of the assassin, but he did not live to see the royal-imperial revolution complete its designs against Southern Italy.

Thirteen days after Ferdinand's young son, Francis II., had ascended the throne, Garibaldi, with "the Thousand," sailed from Genoa, openly, under the protection of Cavour. Six days later (May 11, 1859), the hero of the red shirt landed at Marsala, convoyed by the Piedmontese and the English fleets; and then began the famous march of the Thousand. Writing of the inroads of the barbarians, of the wars of the Turks, of Europe in the tenth century, one need be neither a Michelet nor a Carlyle and yet make us shudder at every line. The march of the Thousand is not less full of horrors. A Mazzinian since 1833, a traitor who had dishonored his uniform and his oath, a fugitive condemned to death, a corsair, a wandering insane freebooter, this enemy of civilization, Garibaldi, was indeed a fitting representative of England, of Napoleon, and of Victor Emmanuel in the campaign for Liberty and Unity.¹ Not an Englishman would have trusted a wife's or a daughter's honor in his hands,—unless the women carried daggers,—and yet no country more than England struggled to make his name popular. In a great American city some intemperate admirers set up a monument of this son of Cain,—a monument whose ugliness is typical of his soul,—and a mayor, pretentiously pedagogical, honored the unveiling with his presence and his praises. Why? Perhaps the mayor had studied logic in the same school with a noted American educator, who, not many years ago, deliberately penned the following words: "It was a large defect in Garibaldi that he was an atheist, and seldom attacked the Pope without attacking religion. His atheism unbalanced his judgment and impaired his good qualities. Happily, his antagonism to religion did not assume its irreconcilable character and prominence until he had done what he could under the skilful direction of Cavour."² The famous Mr. Dogberry insisted that somebody else should "write him down" with an unpretending title. A doctor of divinity may, therefore, indirectly appeal to the world to permit him to write himself down as humbly as pleaseth him. Still, history,

¹ In the *Memoires de Garibaldi*, Paris, 1860, Alexandre Dumas gives a sympathetic sketch of the life of the pride of Nice. Probably no living man is better fitted to appreciate Garibaldi's character and career than that master and mouth-piece of the disgustful, M. Dumas.

² "Modern Italy." President D. H. Wheeler, D.D., L.L.D., in the *Chautauquan*, November, 1885, p. 70.

unless it be wholly humorous, is not helped by such covert sarcasms as we have just quoted. Few readers will, without a note of warning, ever think of looking for a sharp-pointed hook deep down beneath the doctor's serene float.

There was an Anglo-Sicilian legion among the Thousand, and besides there were Hungarians, Poles, Frenchmen, and Greeks,—quite a spontaneous exhibition of the unified demands of the Neapolitans and Sicilians for Piedmontese rule. With Fra Pantaleo, “their Ugo Bassi,” at the head of the column, the Thousand adventurers robbed and slaughtered from one end of the island to the other. The friar, marching first, bore aloft a Cross six feet high. If there were one emblem that Garibaldi and his crowd hated more than another, it was the Cross of Christ; but he, like Mazzini and all the other contemptible unbelieving Italian revolutionists, used the Cross and indeed the most solemn offices, and the very sacraments of the Church, hypocritically, sacrilegiously, in order to mislead the peasants, and simple folk generally. At Alcamo, where the Thousand slaughtered awfully, and where they threw the bodies of the dead to the dogs¹ and to beasts of prey, the revolutionary movement really took form. And there at Alcamo, amid the howling dogs satiating themselves with “Italian” flesh and crunching “Italian” bones, Fra Pantaleo, beneath the Cross, hailed “the new Constantine who by this sign has won and ever will win,” and the lecherous blasphemer of God and of Christ entered the Church while the Benediction was ostentatiously celebrated.²

Fame first spread her wings over the recent Italian Bismarck, Signor Francesco Crispi, when the Thousand reached Marsala. Garibaldi was only occasionally a good judge of men; but in the case of Crispi he showed—or was it intuition? Secretary of State forthwith was Crispi; and within three weeks he had been promoted to the Ministry of the Interior as well as of the Finances. Of late years he was criticized for monopolizing the Ministerial Portfolios of the Piedmontese government, but only by those who did not know what a wide experience he had thirty years back. When Palermo was captured, the off-scouring of many lands crowded into the ranks of the Thousand. The brigands were there already. Prison-birds were set free. The doors of the foundling asylum were thrown open, and many of the foundlings were enlisted in the ranks of the Thousand.³ Robbing; maiming; assassinating men, women, and children; confiscating the property of religious orders; driving out religious men and women; overturn-

¹ *Quatre Mois de l'Expédition de Garibaldi en Sicile et en Italie*, de H. Durand-Brager, Paris, 1861, p. 21.

² *La Spedizione dei Mille*, per Rigoni Luigi, p. 32 et seq.

³ *Quatre Mois de l'Expédition de Garibaldi*, H. Durand-Brager, p. 69.

ing municipality after municipality; and submitting peaceful citizens, unprotected by soldiery or police, to the lawless rule of the rabble. Thousand, Garibaldi finally dictated to Sicily. The King at Naples was insulted and tricked by Cavour, and shamelessly cheated by Louis Napoleon. No sooner had Francis II. granted a general amnesty to all political offenders, than from every side the most dangerous revolutionaries flocked into the country. Piedmont, Napoleon, were amusing themselves at the King's expense. The whole power of the government had been secretly undermined. Landing in Sicily, Garibaldi opened a heavy purse. Thirty ducats he paid to every deserter from the royal army; forty if the coward stole a gun.¹ In Naples the Piedmontese government had not waited until the *condottiere* moved. The army, the navy had been purchased, as well as the police and the magistracy,—not to mention royal ministers. Trusted men had been bribed to render useless the machinery and the steering-gear of the fleet.² Aided by the French and English men-of-war, Garibaldi entered the Neapolitan territory, and the King withdrew to Gaeta. Then Piedmont threw off the shreds of the mask it had shamelessly worn. Victor Emmanuel took the field, while his navy *bombarded* Italians. "Not my crown, but the independence of our common country do I defend," said the King at Gaeta. Beaten he went into exile, and in Naples, standing shoulder to shoulder with Garibaldi,—*arcades ambo*,—Victor Emmanuel announced to the wondering inhabitants of the Two Sicilies that he, there and then, "closed the era of the Revolution, and that, by his system of politics, he was about to reconcile the progress of the people with the stability of the monarchy." Oh! the terrible, terrible comedy!

Unadorned, a picture of the Camorra might send a shudder through a moderately delicate nervous organization, but framed within the white and gold of a half-century of Italian politics, we may take a cautious glance at it without fear of inordinate physical pain. From 1820 to 1860 the Camorra spread its roots wide and fixed them deep in the Neapolitan Kingdom. Blossoming, blooming year after year, scattering fruitful seed and lavishing an aromatic breath, it had enticed beneath the agreeable shade of its interlacing branches a brotherly band of choice spirits. To write of Naples without mentioning the Lazzaroni, would be to write more dully than a maker of books of travel. Some ingenious magazine philosophers have tried to evolve the Camorra out of the *lazzaroni*. Lazzaroni is a name given generally to the poor of the city of Naples for a long time back. Officially the *lazzaroni* were, in

¹ *Les Trente Dernières Années* (1848-1878), Cesare Cantu, Paris, 1880, p. 35.

² *Les Trente Dernières Années* (1848-1878), Cesare Cantu, Paris, 1880, p. 35.

the early part of the last century, acknowledged as "the people." Yearly they elected a chief and certain orators, who were recognized by the authorities. Their complaints and demands were submitted through these chosen representatives, and the Viceroy conferred with the chief of the *lazzaroni* concerning their interests.¹ The *lazzaroni* were not hard workers, very probably, and there were many unruly and bad characters among them. Still, there are countries, far away from Naples, that have only recently begun to think themselves very democratic because some classes of workmen have been permitted to choose a representative who can, of right, submit to the government their complaints and demands. The worse you make the *lazzaroni*, the more democratic the Neapolitan Kings become. It is not the form of government that makes a democracy. The democracy lies in the administration of the government, whatever its form.

The *lazzaroni*, then, were an open and legal body. The Camorra was and is a secret society, whose members were not, nor are they, workmen in the honest sense of the word. To be admissible to the order, the first requirement is that the aspirant be a man of wicked life. (*Mala Vita*.) His word will not suffice to establish his bad character. Either he can give proofs,—he has been in jail, or he is known to have a criminal record,—or else he can satisfy the society's agent that he is bad enough to deserve the title of an "honored youth,"—a title synonymous with that of *Mala Vita*.² An "honored youth" who has passed the scrutiny of the Camorra's agent is accepted as a novice. The immediate advantage of this degree is not considerable. Under a severe master, the novice is trained in all manner of villany. All his family ties must be severed. The Camorra will henceforth be his family. Of the rulers of the order, of its workings or membership, he knows nothing. The commands given him he must blindly obey. Himself he must support at the expense of others, and, at the same time, whatever money he gathers by the appointment of his superior must be turned into the chief's hand. In the use of the dagger he is trained scientifically, just as the Carbonari were. He receives a course of anatomy, and knows how to kill, or disable, or disfigure a victim with a single blow. Secrecy and brute courage he must give proof of. To cheat and deceive he must be able. A Camorrist is not a mere bully; he is also a skilled confidence-man. In all gambling games he is knowing. Of three or four trades he has some knowledge, and thus can ply his prime vocation under varying conditions. A word of complaint against a superior counts

¹ Colletta, *History of Naples*, vol. i., translated by S. Homer, Edinburgh, 1858, p. 200.

² *La Camorra*, Giuseppe Alongi, Torino, 1890, p. 39.

against a novice. An odd copper, a drink, an occasional dinner, make up his wages. The Camorra has many irons in the fire, and the novice must watch them, day or night, as the master commands.¹

Should the "honored youth" win the chief's good will by obedient and smart service, he will in time be advanced a step higher. An especially daring fellow, who gets himself into jail by some audacious crime, or who, committing a lawless act, manages to escape imprisonment, is marked for speedy promotion. There are forms to be followed, and no one attains the second degree except at a solemn meeting of the lodge. In presence of his seniors the applicant bares his head. The chief is easily recognized; all the brethren deposit their arms at his feet. Then his recent master gives the novice a character. He has served the society in many ways; he has stabbed so and so, beaten so and so. He is worthy of being a *picciotto*. The lodge votes. If all agree, the candidate is permitted to kiss the members, beginning with the ancient. Formerly the Camorra, like the Carbonari, were sworn upon a dagger. Now the kiss is their oath. The kiss means brotherhood and secrecy.²

The *picciotto* is supreme over the honored youth. He is given a closer view of the methods of the society. To a small share of the gains he is admitted. Should he be arrested or convicted the whole power of the Camorra is placed at his service. The *picciotto* is a hard-worked apprentice. High above him is the Camorra. Two years, and perhaps ten, will pass before he is admitted to its ranks. As before, he has a master, whose commands he receives daily. His responsibilities are greater than ever. The watch upon him is close. If he is to reach the coveted Camorra quickly, it will be by surpassing his fellow *picciotti* in servility and in audacity. At a moment's notice he will be required to poignard a brother-*picciotto* who has betrayed them, an enemy of the society, a policeman. He asks no questions. If his instructions be limited to maiming or slashing, he will be careful and sure. By the time he is deemed worthy of the Camorra degree, he will have been convicted at least ten times in the courts, and will thus have a valuable experience in the jails and penitentiaries.

Let us suppose that a certain *picciotto* has, by a prudent recklessness in crime, made a name for himself. Either his superiors will, of their own motion, call him to the higher degree, or, if they are lukewarm, he will press his claims upon their attention. He

¹ For details see Alongi, *loc. cit.*, pp. 39-40, and also the *Confession of a Camorrist*, pp. 194-200.

² Alongi, *loc. cit.*, pp. 200-204.

is notified that upon a day named the Camorra will consider his case. At a meeting of the *picciotti* he returns the kiss they gave him years ago, and is ready for his tryst with the Camorra. First of all, he passes an examination in the code of the society. Then he is left to himself for a time. When recalled, the chief impresses upon him the solemnity of the obligation he is about undertaking, and the seriousness of the risks he will have to run. Murdered he may be, or hung; and imprisonment is almost a certainty. Obedient he must be unto death. Were his own father to strike a brother-Camorrist, it is the latter that he must defend. His own life he must sacrifice at the Camorra's behest. Will he withdraw? There is yet time. He is ready for anything. Here and now "he will put one foot in the galleys and another in the grave."

Not infrequently the candidate's fitness and loyalty are tested by a refusal of the degree. When finally accepted he is ordered to meet the brethren. All weapons are laid at the chief's feet. The candidate receives and gives a kiss, and thus swears fidelity to the Camorra. Then the chief, taking a dagger, draws from himself blood, which the candidate drinks. Each Camorrist follows the example of the chief, and in turn the neophyte sucks each wound. Thus he and they become one in blood. As yet the ceremony of the degree is not complete. The neophyte is dismissed, and the chief's will is again brought before a meeting of the lodge. The chief holds in his hand three daggers. He names a member, who advances. With this man have you any enmity? the neophyte is asked. None; very well, you shall fight him, forthwith. Choose your weapons! See that you do not wound one another in the trunk! The combatants select a dagger each. Beside each man a second stands, dagger in hand. Should a foul blow be struck, the seconds will promptly punish the offender. Stabbing as best they can, the combatants fight on until the chief interferes. If the neophyte does not gain the battle, he is suspended. But he is granted a second and a third trial. Winning one of these he is sure of an election. Failing, he can have no immediate hope of advancement. In these duels, as they wound one another, they suck one another's wounds. The Camorrists are skilful surgeons and quickly heal the deep cuts inflicted in the struggle.¹

Having, like a man, stabbed his blood-brother properly, our *picciotto* is baptized—they have the word—a Camorrist. The names of the chief and of the officers are confided to him. In any jail let him state these, with the date of his reception, and the name of the brother whom he beat down with his dagger, and our Camorrist need give himself no further trouble. The jail is the Camorrist's

¹ Alongi, *loc. cit.*, pp. 63-68, and 204-212.

palace. There he has lorded it since 1820. The *picciotto* knew this; he knew also that once a Camorrist his chances of imprisonment were much less than before. However, he learns much that is new. The order has a head and a chief council. He is informed who they are. Appointed to work within geographical limits that are closely fixed, he is made acquainted with the local officials. Each section has a head or president, with a double vote at the meetings, a treasurer, an ancient and a secretary. A majority rules, and the ancient speaks and votes first. The arrest of an official, or of all the officials, will not interrupt the working of a section. By the unwritten constitution these vacancies are provided for. To crush the Camorra is not an easy task. The newly elected member is no longer dependent on the charity of his superiors; he is a partner in the ill-gotten gains of the order. Every week or fortnight returns are made to the chief, who hands over the cash to the treasurer. A share is put aside for the police; another is reserved for the members in jail; a third goes to the aged, a fourth to the widows and orphans of those who have dropped on the gallows; next come the officials, who do not treat themselves ill. The remainder is divided equally between the Camorrists, who are happily called the "proprietors." Suspected or suspended members are deprived of their share.

Becoming a proprietor, the Camorrist assumes new and heavy responsibilities. Should he be suspected of double dealing or treachery, a brother's dagger will pierce his heart. Cowardice in carrying out the orders of his superiors, theft, or indeed crime of any sort, committed for his own special advantage, rebellion against his chief—the dagger is the penalty. Rarely are these sentences executed outside of the lodge meeting. The trial is short and the penalty immediate. No one man can claim the honor of the assassination. Lesser offenses are visited with punishments more moderate—kissing of the hands or feet of one or more of the members of the lodge, the patient acceptance of brother's spittle in the face—or of substances deemed less clean. Between these punishments and that of assassination, there is one whose barbarity is almost incredible, even when we think of it in connection with the Camorra. *Lo sfregio*, they call it. A member is appointed to disfigure the offender for life. With a dagger the minister of justice slits the victim's face from the line of the eye down to the chin, and from ear to ear. Purposely the edge of the dagger is hacked; and, by practice, some of these slashers can cut a cross into a man's face in an instant, selecting the very lines that assure muscular contraction and an indelible, horrible life-mark.¹

¹ For details, and there are others even more disgusting, see Alongi, *loc. cit.*, pp. 38-47.

The Camorrist can always depend on his dagger. He manufactures knives according to his fancy or needs. With pieces of glass he makes an ingenious article. Let there be a quarrel, the knives suddenly glint in the air as though the sky were darting daggers.¹

With new responsibilities, the Camorrist acquires valued privileges. The "honored youth" and the *picciotti* are his humble servants. He dresses well, lives well, is admired by many and feared by many more. In trouble he has an army of staunch friends. His risk of the jail is less than before. The crimes that fall to his lot are not as weighty as those with which the *picciotto* is commonly charged. In jail, strange to say, a percentage of Camorrists prefer to be. Since 1820 the order has ruled the prisons. In them, as in the penitentiaries, and in each division of prison and of penitentiary, the Camorra is organized. The chief, the treasurer, the secretary and the ancient are functioning as freely as if they were at large. The convicts who are not members of the order pay the Camorrist piper. On all games of chance played in the jail, a tax must be paid to the chief of the Camorra. Without his purchased consent the convict can neither eat, drink nor smoke. Of any moneys he receives, ten per cent. goes to the Camorra. Should he buy or sell anything, the Camorra makes the price, and pays itself a commission. His daggers they confiscate. The clothes given to the convict twice a year, the Camorra will purchase cheaply and re-sell them to the prison officials. Half the convict's victuals the Camorra appropriates. Taking possession of the rations, it distributes them as it pleases. A respectable authority states that convicts who were starved by these savages have been glad to eat straw and bits of rags. For its own profit the Camorra encourages gambling and all other sorts of dissipation among the prisoners. The correspondence of the jail must pass through the Camorra's hands. Convicts are compelled to beg money from relatives, no matter how poor, in order that the Camorra may steal it. In saying that they will take the shirt off the convict's back, there is no exaggeration. Why do the convicts submit? They have a choice—submission, or else a beating or the dagger. The Camorra, we repeat, is completely organized in the prisons. Without telegraphic instruments, there is telegraphic communication between the various parts of the jail. By means of manual signs, by tappings on the walls, messages are transmitted rapidly and precisely. Letters are exchanged without de-

¹ A writer in the *Sun* of June 28, 1891, p. 27, describing "Weapons Italians carry," gives much interesting information concerning the body-arsenals recently imported into the United States. The illustrations accompanying the *Sun* article will serve all readers of the history of Italy in the 19th century.

tection ; if discovered they betray no secret, written as they are with invisible ink and in cipher.¹

With the outside world, the Camorra of the prisons is closely and powerfully connected. The society has accommodated itself to all classes of people, the highest as well as the lowest. There is a "kid-glove" Camorra. Before examining this division of the order, let us follow the convict Camorrist who has been discharged from jail. Having paid his compliments to the local president, he is assigned to work ; and this work consists largely in blackmail — a blackmail that is patiently borne in every Neapolitan community. Daily from all games of chance, public or private, the Camorra collects a fixed tax. The cabman, the boatman, the professional beggar, the prostitute, the unaffiliated thief, the marketmen, fruit sellers, porters, waiters in hotels and in restaurants, the small tradesmen, the winners in the lottery—all were subject to the Camorrist's constant supervision. The business of smuggling by land or sea, they controlled. They were coiners of false money. The pawn-broker was not free from their extortion ; nor did they spare the clergy, nor the members of pious associations. To refuse their demands insured persistent persecution, false or true charges in the courts, robbery, a beating or stabbing, perhaps murder. Few had the courage to oppose the Camorra ; indeed, opposition was useless. The far-reaching influence of the society was apparent ; and therefore many paid willingly in order to enjoy the protection which it extended to friends and supporters.²

Such is the account given by Italians of the Camorra from 1820 to 1859. How did it manage to control the prisons ? Remembering the history of the country during the century we cannot doubt of the demoralization of the very class of men that served as keepers in the jails. If many of them were Camorrist's, it would not be surprising. Assuredly many belonged to the Carbonaria. Can any one tell why a Carbonaro should not have respected and protected a Camorrist ? Reasons can be stated why the members of the two societies should have been friendly. Mazzini's religion was that of the Italian revolutionaries, and Liberty, he defined as "the right of every man to exercise his faculties without impediment or restraint in the accomplishment of his special mission, and in the choice of the means most conducive to its accomplishment." According to this authoritative definition, the Camorrist was the most legitimate of all the sons of Italian Liberty. Making a study of the society independent of other existing Italian societies, Giuseppe Alongi, whom we have frequently quoted, has been

¹ For the confirmation of these facts, by various observers, see Alongi, *loc. cit.*, pp. 70-94.

² Alongi, *loc. cit.*, pp. 95-113.

unfair to the Camorra as many other Italian writers have been. As far back as 1819, "every criminal enrolled himself a member of the Carbonari, as well as all who were meditating fresh crimes," writes Colletta, and "the prisons were thus converted into *Vendite*."¹ Here we have testimony that the Carbonari controlled the jails before the organization of the Camorra. Mazzini's "Young Italy," as we have seen, was largely recruited from the criminal classes. Throughout Italy the professional thieves and assassins gladly sought membership in associations that covered them with the touching name of "political victims." Even under the Bourbons we can, therefore, understand why the Camorra of the jails was not suppressed. Outside of social relations, there were other reasons why the Camorra enjoyed such extraordinary liberties in the prisons. They divided their gains with the keepers, and, besides, they relieved these keepers of much trouble. In return for the favors granted them, the Camorra saw that order was maintained in the prisons—an order, however disorderly, that permitted the officials to enjoy a leisurely life. Under the Bourbons, the government did not have any political relations with the Camorra. It would be surprising, however, if the police did not use members of the order, and were not in turn used by them. On criminals not affiliated with it, the Camorra was always ready to peach. Everywhere the detectives count on the criminal to aid in tracking the criminal. It was reserved for the "liberals," who were doing the unclean work of Victor Emmanuel, Napoleon, Garibaldi and Palmerston, in their scheme to gain possession of Naples, and thus the more easily to put an end to the temporal power of the Popes—it was reserved for these liberals to invite the Camorra to political fellowship, and to give this terrible society of criminals a political power that, after thirty years, is still vigorous.

The conspiracy of the "liberals" with the Camorra is a matter of history, a fact not to be gainsaid. Poerio's and Spaventa's names are not unknown. They were the go-betweens on behalf of the "liberals." Certain patriots, writes Giuseppe Alongi, seeing that from the people there was no likelihood of initiative aid being contributed to the cause of the people—*either* because they had been made spiritless by the government and by the clergy, *or* because they were enervated by means of feasts and shows—conceived the idea of an alliance with the Camorra, "the only force living and organized within the general marasmus of the masses." This is a hard saying, out of the mouth of an Italian who dates his preface from that same Alcamo where the dogs had their day.

¹ *History of Naples*, vol. ii. p., 318.

The Camorra was true to its word, and when Garibaldi entered Naples they supplied the "initiative aid" which "the patriots" expected from "the people." What bargain was made with the Camorra? Hardly had the king got out of Naples, on his way to the army at Gaeta, when a Minister, Don Liborio Romano, wrote to Garibaldi, addressing him as "the wholly invincible general and Dictator of the Two Sicilies."¹ It was the same Liborio Romano that welcomed the Camorra as auxiliaries in the "cause of order and law." This meant that "the patriots" would keep their side of the bargain. "Needing a regular police," says Alongi, "and not able otherwise to control the Camorra, reinforced as it had been by all the criminals freed from the prisons, the liberals committed to the Camorra the maintenance of order." God help the people! you exclaim. "The idea was a happy one," writes Signor Alongi, "notwithstanding the sad consequences that later resulted from it."² Signor Alongi professes to be a scientist, but he has evidently mistaken his trade. From this one sentence any one will recognize that he was cut out for a philosopher—liberal of course. Something more than the maintenance of order the liberals committed to the Camorra's charge. The collection of the port dues and of the duties payable at the city gates was placed in their orderly, cleanly hands. Happy were the consequences resulting from this change. The receipts of the port were speedily decreased by one Salvatore Crescenzi, who managed them, from 40,000 ducats a day to less than 1000. And Pasquale Menotte, who supervised the gates, allowed four whole cents to be turned in as the revenue of a single day.³

The political union of the liberals with the Camorra reinforced the society's ranks not only with all the criminals freed from the jails, but with a new element of strength—a considerable representation from the comfortable middle class, from the professions, and from the higher ranks of society. And the reformed Camorra, made up from all these classes, resisting the "persecuting" efforts of the "liberals" to destroy it, still lives and moves in South Italy. The "kid-glove" Camorra, having special sections and special officers, exactly like the Camorra *bassa*, supplies valuable information to the thieves who do the hard work. Plans of houses, notes concerning the habits of the occupants, details about the location of treasure, the Camorra *elegante* provides. The names of many of the "kid-gloves" have been publicly mentioned. The magistracy, *on dit*, has not been free from affiliations with the society. In the

¹ Cantu, *Les Trentes Dernières Années*, p. 86.

² *Loc. cit.*, p. 35.

³ See an article in the *Saturday Review* for 1884, p. 96; one of several articles on the subject that appeared there in 1884-1885. See also Alongi, *loc. cit.*, pp. 106-108.

Provincial Council, and even in the Cabinet, Neapolitan authorities insist that the Camorra has its representatives. Among the school-teachers the Camorra can point to influential friends; and there are lawyers in its service. What is worth knowing, politically, the Camorra knows first of all. In the courts, so plentiful are its witnesses, and so many are the respectable persons ready to give the criminals a good character, that conviction is almost impossible. Corrupt liberal politicians, in their efforts to gain or hold power and to acquire wealth, have extended the influence of this shameful society.¹ In the jails the Camorra still rules despotically, with a system hardly less ferocious, but no less thorough than that we have described. The prisoners are still taxed and defrauded after the old fashion. The Camorra's code of justice is still applied.²

Learned historians, like the very reverend American educator we have quoted, invariably seek to prejudice a reader against the people of the Two Sicilies by charging them with exceptional ignorance. The percentage of those who could not read or write, in 1861, for instance, is adduced as an argument—to what end?³ We have ill-digested figures stating the increase in the number of readers and writers within twenty years. What is the purpose of these figures? To convey the idea that instruction in reading and writing has *educated* the people into virtue? Signor Alongi, who, with a queer jumble of “psycho-pathology,” “auto-geneticism,” “philo-geneticism,” “anthropologico-psychiatrism” and “Darwinianism,” explains the growth of the Camorra to his own satisfaction, but who rather weakens the consistency of the pastry by mixing in too much essence of Bourbon and clerical baking-powder—Signor Alongi cannot be humbugged on the school question. “Open a school and close a prison;” thus many have been crying out, claiming that with the spelling-book we should inaugurate the reign of peace and fraternity. The sweet illusion! The Camorra is no longer made up of a crowd of ferocious “analphabetists.” In the schools, and by the aid of the prison libraries, many of them have completed their instruction. And these are the men who make the order most dangerous and invincible. They have mastered the code, and know the rules of civil procedure better than an experienced magistrate. They can lie skilfully. They will even charge the innocent with being accomplices. They are quick in providing *alibi* witnesses; and the more instructed “kid-gloves” are at their beck.⁴ English writers have always delighted in painting the

¹ See testimony from various sources, given by Alongi, *loc. cit.*, pp. 31–34.

² See details, Alongi, *loc. cit.*, pp. 76–94.

³ The reader is referred to a profound article on “Modern Italy,” in the “*Chautauquan*,” Feb. 1886, p. 262, by President D. H. Wheeler, D.D., LL.D.

⁴ Alongi, *loc. cit.*, pp. 80–81.

Italian brigands with medals around their necks and rosaries in their hands, and Signor Alongi is not the only Italian who pictures the Camorrist as a superstitious believer in the immortality of the soul and in the existence of a God. In one way or another these facts are supposed to militate against the Catholic Church. Now, Ausonio Franchi, in his day a Mazzinian, and at one time Master of a lodge, states plainly that the reformed Italian Carbonari, to-day, worship the devil in their lodges. If it were a choice between a "superstitious" Camorra and a devil-worshipping Camorra, which should you prefer to see in this country, non-Catholic friend? What sort they have in Italy, Signor Alongi will tell us. "The Camorrist of to-day is tinctured with modern skepticism, professes to be *un esprit fort*, though the remnants of the old superstition appear as soon as there is question of spirits, or of the evil eye." Arguing from these facts, we beg to suggest a new aphorism: Open a non-religious school and close a church!

With the terrible experience the Two Sicilies have undergone during the past hundred years, and with all they have suffered from usurpers, brigands, and unsuperstitious revolutionaries, the "people" are not to be confounded either with the brigands, the Carbonari, or the Camorrist, kid-gloved or horny-handed. Notwithstanding the persecution of the Napoleons, Mazzinians, Garibaldians and Piedmontese; notwithstanding the studied attempts made to corrupt, to demoralize them wholly—attempts inspired and supported by detestable kings and ministries; notwithstanding the persistent efforts of leaders of thought, of premiers, senates and assemblies to educate or to force them into irreligion—the "people" of both countries are an amiable, generous, industrious and Christian people. A most intelligent, talented people they are, and even to-day, a religious people, thanks to the Roman Catholic Church, which, oppressed under Bourbon and Bonapartist, under Garibaldian and Sardinian, has, in Naples and in Sicily, as elsewhere throughout the world, watered, nourished the seed of Faith—seed from which alone the blossom and fruit of morality and of civilization may perennially, beautifully spring.

¹ Alongi, *loc. cit.*, p. 59.

THE ROMAN CATACOMBS.

THE word *catacomb* is not of Christian origin, and all derivations of its meaning are conjectural and uncertain. Subterranean Christian cemeteries, similar in general design to the Roman ones, and which it is agreed by archæologists to designate by the generic name of catacombs, existed all over the Roman empire. They have been discovered, explored and described in the east at Antioch, Alexandria, the island of Cyprus; in Africa, in the cities along the Mediterranean coast; in the west, at Naples; at Messina, Syracuse and other towns of Sicily; in Tuscany, particularly at Chiesi; in the island of Malta, in Spain, as at Elvira, Saragossa, Seville; among the Gauls, as at Agannum (now *Saint-Maurice*), at Cologne, at Treves. The name of catacomb was originally applied only to the cemetery of Saint Sebastian on the Appian way, outside of Rome; and because this one was the only subterranean Christian cemetery which was never entirely closed, blocked up and lost, but was visited by pilgrims all through the Middle Ages, as other cemeteries were rediscovered, they were all called catacombs.

The earliest of these cemeteries were small and were private property, existing under the surface of some *arca* or overground tomb. In the beginning and, in general, with rare exceptions all along, nothing could be more secure for the Christians than the catacombs, because Roman law was distinguished for its protection of every kind of real property—property in or on the soil, and more particularly still, for its severity in defending the inviolability of tombs and burial-places, which was a part of their natural religion. At the beginning of the third century, most of the catacombs became semi-public; that is, were held not merely under the general law of the Church received by all the faithful, but while the *dominium* still continued to be vested in some particular individual, they were possessed by the Church called officially *Ecclesia Fratrum*, as a recognized corporation for burial purposes; although the Church was at no time during the ages of persecution a legalized institution of the empire as other religious denominations were. This state of affairs was an attempt to reach some *modus vivendi* between Church and State. The representative or recognized head of these burial corporations in every diocese, was the bishop; consequently in Rome, it was the Pope. We therefore come to the strange but well-proven fact that at Rome, along with the official lists of the prefects of the city and of other state officers,

along with the official membership of the legalized colleges of priests with the Pontifex Maximus at their head, there was kept an official series, in the public archives, of the bishops of Rome who were there inscribed as *Antistites Ecclesiæ Fratrum*. Incredible as it seems—but “truth is stranger than fiction”—these official lists and other matter connected with the early Papacy, preserved in the departments of pagan Rome, were at times consulted by the Apostolic prothonotaries, in writing or correcting the “Acts of Martyrs” and other documents of interest to the Church, and were freely used by the very ancient but now unknown author upon whose collection Anastasius the librarian composed, in the 9th century, his invaluable “*Liber Pontificalis*”; or *Lives of the Popes*. The first general edict against these Christian cemeteries was published by the Emperor Valerian in the year 257; but even this was directed rather against their use as places of secret assembly or of congregating for worship, than as burial places. In the year 260, Gallienus revoked the edict of his predecessor and ordered by an imperial rescript that throughout the empire the *loca religiosa* (“religious places”) in their widest sense, which had been confiscated of all the Christians, should be restored to the bishop of each church. Also when Maxentius put a stop for a time to the persecution in the year 306, the property of the Church in Rome was given back to the then reigning Pope, Melchiades, who, we may here remark, was the last Pope interred in the catacombs. From the pontificate of Saint Fabian, in 236, each one of the twenty-five titles or parishes of Rome had its own cemetery or catacomb outside of the city precincts. The most famous of all the Roman catacombs—and sixty have already been discovered—was that of Saint Callixtus, because it contained the papal crypt or official tomb of the Popes from Zephyrinus, in 220, to Melchiades, in 314. The special titles or names of the catacombs were derived chiefly from one or other of three sources: the name of the original proprietor of the soil, as the cemetery of Priscilla; the name of the most celebrated martyr interred there, as the cemetery of Prætextatus; the name of the Pope who made, enlarged, renewed or decorated it, as the cemetery of Callixtus. The catacombs were the ordinary burial places of the early Christians, but not their usual and habitual places of divine worship. They were used for purposes of religious congregation and of concealment only at times of active persecution or for other urgent reasons. Thus Popes Pontian, Antherus, Fabian and Cornelius, taking refuge in these underground hiding-places, remained concealed there; and despite the impious edict of the Emperor Valerian, of which we have spoken, Popes Stephen I. and Sixtus II. lived some time in the catacombs, and being discovered were both

put to death there, while in the act of officiating in the presence of a number of the faithful. With Pope Sixtus II. four deacons suffered martyrdom. Saint Gregory of Tours tells us in his treatise on the "Story of the Martyrs," that in the year 284 a multitude of the faithful also had been seen entering the crypt on the Via Salaria to venerate the tombs of Saints Chrysanthus and Daria, recently put to death; the entrance was quickly closed up by order of the Emperor Numerianus; and when, after the lapse of years, the catacomb was reopened, there were found not only the skeletons of men, women and children lying around, but also the silver cruets which these worshippers had taken down with them for the celebration of the holy mysteries. When peace was given to the Church by the famous Edict of Toleration issued by the Emperor Constantine, at Milan, in the year 313, the catacombs still continued for some years to be used by the Christians as their burial places. Later on, this was done only exceptionally in order to rest after death near the venerated remains of some martyr. This legitimate regrettable devotion has sometimes occasioned, to the inexpressible distress of antiquarians, the cutting into and the partial destruction of ancient mural paintings. After the capture of Rome by Alaric the Goth, in the year 410, burial in the catacombs almost entirely ceased; yet they were frequented as places of pious resort, especially on the anniversaries—*Natalitia*—of martyrs for some centuries still. Saint Jerome, in prose, and Prudentius, in verse—authors of the 5th century—have left us their vivid impressions and some descriptions of these holy places.

From the fifth to the eighth century, the catacombs were searched, rifled, despoiled, broken up and ruined by the barbarians—Goths, Vandals, Huns, and Lombards—in quest of buried treasure. The love of lucre, however, was not always the motive which moved these, in some cases, heathens, in others, Arian heretics, to their work of destruction; it was often hatred of the Catholic Church. The Goths, particularly, under king Vitiges, in 537, destroyed all the churches and oratories built over the more celebrated tombs of martyrs, and violated the underlying bones of the saints. This is so true, that it was for this reason, rather than for the burning of the palaces, porticoes, and other monuments of the imperial city, that the term *Gothic* came to signify whatever was supremely rude and barbarous; for, among all people, the desecration of sacred edifices and the disturbance of the dead, have been accounted the climax of impiety. It was now that the touching, and, even in point of mechanical execution, really elegant metrical inscriptions, composed and set up by Pope Damasus in the fourth century, were broken to pieces, and would have altogether perished but for the care of one of his successors, Vigilius,

to gather the fragments, and when nothing sufficient was found, to set up copies in the place of the originals after the devastating hordes had retired. One of these Damatine inscriptions on marble was recently discovered, broken into one hundred and twenty-six pieces, which have been skilfully put together, and the whole set up again *in situ*. Under Pope John III., in 568, other restorations in the catacombs were undertaken, and every Sunday the Holy Sacrifice was offered in each one of them, with sacred vessels, vestments, and liturgical books, sent expressly from the pontifical palace of the Lateran. But to restore the catacombs was useless; and after the deplorable devastations of the Lombards, under king Astulphus, Pope Paul I., in 757, reluctantly determined to remove from their original resting places, and out of the reach of harm, some of the most illustrious and more easily accessible bodies of martyrs, and distribute their relics among the churches of Rome. We learn from an ancient inscription, put up in Saint Praxedes, that on July 20, 817, Pope Pascal I. removed two thousand three hundred bodies from the catacombs. A little later, under Pope Boniface IV., the Pantheon, a deserted heathen temple, which had remained up to this time uninjured, was consecrated as a Christian church, and having received within its ample space a great number of sacred remains borne from the catacombs with religious pomp, and a long procession of triumphal cars that had been heir-looms in senatorial and patrician families, acquired its modern name of *Saint Mary and the Martyrs*, *Sancta Maria ad Martyres*. From this period until the sixteenth century, the very existence of the catacombs, always excepting that of St. Sebastian, was unknown save by vague tradition. This one, or more properly a small portion of this one, continued open and accessible all through the Middle Ages, and witnessed the prayers of Saints Bridget of Sweden, Catharine of Sienna, Philip Neri, and Charles Borromeo. On the 31st of May, 1578, a casual breaking in of part of the catacombs of Priscilla, on the Via Salaria, about two miles outside of Rome, revealed to the astonished view of thousands who flocked to the spot, paintings, inscriptions, sculptured stone coffins, and lengthy galleries, of which even the learned—and these were few—had only indistinct ideas, gathered from old Itineraries, Martyrologies, and Missals in which the *Stations* were marked on certain festivals. Let us here quote what we wrote a quarter of a century ago, on the very spot, and on the very anniversary day of such a discovery, in which a new Rome and a new world were revealed to archæology: "Just at that time, when the Protestant movement was completely in the ascendant throughout the north of Europe, and the bloodstained sword which had wounded our Holy Mother was victoriously sheathed, and the pen was taken

up to excuse the revolt, just then, when the spirit of argument was most rife, and the successors of the Reformers, half-ashamed of their violence, were loudest in their appeal to antiquity, invoking on their side the Primitive Church, the earth opened, and the depths gave up their dead and buried treasures of painting, sculpture, inscription, phials of martyrs' blood, instruments of martyrs' torture, monuments of every kind; each, in succession, of the sixty catacombs around the Eternal City protesting, through the silence and oblivion of eight hundred years, against those who falsely accused Rome of change, and of corruption in doctrine and in practice. To the indictment of Rome's enemies, these subterranean and apostolic witnesses gave a prompt, unanimous, and peremptory denial." This was the beginning of ardent studies in these venerable cemeteries. A Maltese layman, named Bosio, who was then residing in Rome as Procurator of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem, made many explorations among them, and worked with so much success that he has been called the Columbus of the Catacombs. Among the successors of this great man, the study of Christian antiquities was, in most cases, made less upon actual and personal investigation of monuments than on the text of ancient documents, now being brought daily to light in ransacking monasteries, chapter-houses, and the archives of private families. A new and happier, because more practical, direction was given to the study of the catacombs about fifty years ago, by a learned Jesuit, Father Marchi, whom we had the honor of knowing when, in his later years, he was Curator of the famous Kircherian Museum in the Gregorian University, commonly called the Roman College. His most illustrious and successful pupil was the gentle layman, Commendatore John Baptist de Rossi, who, besides his monumental works on the Roman catacombs, on the Roman mosaics, on the Christian inscriptions anterior to the seventh century, still continues to edit the "*Bulletin of Christian Archæology*," which has appeared regularly since the year 1863. From Italy, the study of the catacombs spread to France, England, Belgium, Germany, and even to Russia, in all which countries professional works on the subject have been published. In this connection we should not omit to mention that the success of de Rossi, and of his disciples, in this department of learning, for over twenty-five years, was due in great part, to the zeal, the encouragement and the munificence of the late Pope Pius IX., who established a Commission of Sacred Archæology, and founded the rich and rare museum in the Lateran palace for the preservation, display and study of all newly-discovered remains, inscriptions, and monuments of Christian Rome.

The Roman catacombs merit our attention, because we find in

them the earliest examples of Christian art ; architecture, painting, sculpture, gilded glass ; the earliest figured scenes and persons of the sacred Scriptures ; Moses striking the rock, Jonah thrown up by the whale, Job, Isaiah, the sacrifice of Isaac, the adoration of Christ, the worship of the Mother of Jesus, veneration of relics, invocation of saints, middle state or purgatory, resurrection of the body, souls in bliss immediately after death, esteem of virginity, and holy widowhood, etc., etc.

The soil in the immediate vicinity of Rome is formed of materials which are of igneous or volcanite origin. There are three distinct kinds of formation, each of which varies in surface, depth and position relative to upland and lowland, vicinity to water and other conditions. These are, first, the *Tufa litoide* of geologists, which is very hard and admirably suited for building purposes ; second, the *Pozzolana*, which is much less compact than the tufa, and is very friable and sandlike. It is used to make the famous Roman cement. The pozzolana was always carefully avoided by the Christians in digging the catacombs, because on account of its tendency to crumble and fall in, neither galleries, chambers or graves could be cut out of it. When they struck a stratum of it, this point was instantly receded from, or if it were necessary or very convenient to go through it, the sides and top of the gallery or tunnel were supported by brick masonry. The catacombs, let it be said, once for all, were not abandoned sand-pits, much less burial places used promiscuously by poor Christians and pagans. Our good friend, Michele de Rossi, only less well known to the learned than his brother, the Commendatore, being an expert geologist and topographer, has particularly devoted himself to this aspect of the Roman catacombs and has shown the differences that have always existed between these places of Christian burial and the *arenariæ* or sand-pits of the heathens. The next kind of soil met with in the Roman Campagna is the *Tufa granulare*, which combines adhesion of particles and facility of working. It is in this sort of very hard earth and semi-rock that the Christian subterranean cemeteries called catacombs were hollowed out. It is too soft for building purposes, and not fine enough for cement ; but it possesses just enough consistency to admit of being cut without caving in, and is of such a porous nature that any water quickly drains off, leaving the galleries dry, warm and healthy. It was, therefore, admirably adapted for the reception of the dead and for the purposes of reunion, for which it was used after being excavated with much labor and ingenuity, into the proper forms. We believe that it was a special Providence which put ready to the hands of the persecuted Christians such a material, for whereas all the works, paintings, inscriptions, sculptures of the early Christians

above ground—and there must have been many such if only in the inviolable mansions of the great patrician convert families—have perished without leaving a trace behind them, this buried mine of archæological treasure, by its very obscurity and difficulty of access and facility of being lost or forgotten, has been preserved to all future generations. In the form or internal arrangements of the catacombs, we distinguish galleries, graves, crypts, shafts for admitting light and air, stairs and chambers. The average height of the galleries is about eight feet; but it is sometimes from twelve to fifteen. Their width is usually no more than three feet, so that two persons approaching from opposite directions could hardly pass one another except by backing up to the approaches of the oratories and other places of assembling, which were very numerous. There are several, sometimes as many as five galleries running one above the other, and connected by steps cut into the tufa; light and ventilation being ingeniously provided by funnel-shaped apertures running up and opening into the Campagna above. Artificial light, by lamps and tapers, was, however, always required to dispel the gloom in which only the general outlines and direction of things could be otherwise distinguished. Father Marchi, whose special study was the catacomb of Saint Agnes, calculated that if all its galleries were put together, they would measure a length of sixteen miles; and Michael de Rossi gives it as his opinion (which is that of an expert and the first authority in the world on the subject), that if all the galleries of all the catacombs around Rome were protracted on one line, they would extend to five hundred and eighty-seven miles, or in other words would stretch from one end of Italy to the other. Father Marchi has also calculated that the catacombs contain seven million graves. But many new discoveries have been made since his time, and his figures are probably much below the mark. It was only in times of persecution and on unusual occasions, that the offices of religion were performed in the catacombs. Ordinarily the Sacrifice was offered in some vast hall in a noble's house. After the conversion of Constantine, oratories and churches were erected near the entrance to the principal catacombs; thus was raised Saint Peter's over the cemetery on the Vatican hill, Saint Paul's over that of Lucina on the Ostian way; thus rose the basilicas of Saints Lawrence, Sebastian, Agnes and other athletes of the Faith and other virgins. In laying the broad and deep foundations of these edifices, many graves and many mural paintings had, unfortunately, to be sacrificed, because the workmen had to cut down from an upper to a lower level until the actual tomb of the martyr was reached; and if this tomb had been constructed during one of the later persecutions it would be in one of the lower galleries. For, in exca-

vating a catacomb originally, the work was always commenced with the uppermost gallery ; then the next lower, and so in the same order till the lowermost gallery was completed. Should the tomb, therefore, which was to become the nucleus of a subsequent basilica, by being made its confession or crypt, have been in a lower gallery, it is plain that the graves in the galleries above had to be sacrificed in order to bring the tomb referred to prominently into view in the new church. This tomb was often far from the entrance, as visitors to Saint Agnes and to Saint Lawrence have observed. Pope Saint Damasus who governed the Church from 366 to 384, was the great explorer, embellisher and lover of the catacombs. Himself a poet, he composed many beautiful metrical inscriptions which he set up over or near the bodies of the saints whom he commemorated in his verse. He was fortunate in having the services of an intelligent, artistic and faithful subject named Furius Dionysius Filocalus, by whom these Damasine inscriptions were executed with a mechanical faultlessness and an elegance of lettering which proves him to have been a man of excellent taste. Nothing like their style has ever been found in any other Christian inscriptions, and they can be recognized at a glance as all coming from the same skilful hand. Pope Damasus built many tombs over the remains of martyrs, repaired many galleries, and caused many paintings and decorations to be executed in the catacombs. Pius IX., of happy memory, nobly imitated him ; and in the history of subterranean Rome his name will be conspicuous above all other names, alongside of that of his illustrious predecessors ; and as Damasus had his faithful Filocalus to second his learning and his zeal, Pius had his de Rossi to bear the same relations to himself.

The galleries and chambers of these wonderful subterranean cemeteries received their light either from the open air above through shafts called *luminaria*, or from earthen-ware and sometimes bronze lamps which were either suspended by chainlets from the ceilings or vaulted roof, or were set in little niches cut for this purpose into the walls. These terra-cotta lamps (few were of any other material), consumed olive oil in which a twisted wick was immersed. A great many such lamps have been discovered, and they are very curious either for the words and figures stamped upon them or for the figures into which they are moulded as a whole. The lamps used in the catacombs are all of Christian origin and made for this purpose. A ship—symbol of the Church—is often represented on the face or flat upper part of such lamps, and sometimes the lamp itself has the form of a vessel. The heads of the apostles Peter and Paul—face to face generally—are very common subjects. Other subjects are purely symbolical, as the palm, the

dove, the anchor. The monogram of Christ, under one or other of its varied forms is frequently stamped on these lamps. Some of the square-shaped apertures for light, which beginning at the surface were cut down through the several stories of the catacombs especially at the intersection of galleries, were made at a much later period than the catacombs themselves; but the greater number were cœval with them. We read in the *Acts* of Saints Peter and Marcellinus, of a certain Candida who was thrown headlong down one of these shafts and then crushed with stones. The graves in the catacombs were cut horizontally into the sides of the galleries and chambers in rows or tiers like berths in a passenger ship. These graves thus super-posed are sometimes as many as fifteen. As each grave was occupied, it was closed either with a marble slab or with some flat tiles or bricks, and carefully fastened at the edges with cement. The name of the deceased was either cut on the marble or hastily scratched on one of the bricks at the moment of closing the tomb. Sometimes also a symbol, as a heart, an egg, a fish, an anchor, a dove, a palm tree was more or less rudely cut or scratched there. The graves were called *loculi*. Some are small, evidently for children, while others are long enough for adults. Some are of sufficient depth to hold two, three or even four bodies laid beside one another. The little chambers cut out of the tufa in the catacombs were of various forms: circular, semi-circular, square and even triangular. They were very numerous. Father Marchi penetrated into as many as sixty, in exploring only about one-eighth of the catacombs of Saint Agnes. Very often these chambers were like modern family vaults, used for the burial of some particular group of persons. At one end of every chamber there was the principal tomb called from its arch shape an *Arcosolium*. Beneath it generally reposed a martyr; and it was the desire of those at whose expense the chamber was opened, enlarged or decorated, to be laid to rest beside these sacred remains. When the chamber had no more space left in the sides, the graves of those having the privilege of the family or the association which owned it, were opened in the nearest untouched galleries, care being taken to record by an inscription that although separated from the main body, they belonged to that group of persons buried there. At other times, sad to say, the wall or side of the chamber above and around the martyr's tomb which was generally covered with paintings and inscriptions, was cut into for graves and irreparably damaged through an unreasonable devotion to repose in holy company. Each one of these chambers could contain on an average, seventy graves and one hundred bodies of old and young. The arcaded tombs of the more illustrious martyrs were generally opened at the expense of the Church, at one side of a chamber of

larger size which served for the reunion of the faithful. The Holy Sacrifice was offered—especially and always on the anniversary—on the marble slab or table covering the tomb. Thus the *arcosolium* was a fixed altar. In order that as many as possible should assist at the celebration of the holy mysteries on the anniversary of the martyrs, two, three, or often four of these chambers were made close together, or opening into one another like a suite of apartments, and receiving light and air from a common shaft leading down into the principal room or into the intersecting gallery that separated it from the next one. “In this way as many as a hundred persons might be collected in some parts of the catacombs to assist at the same act of public worship; whilst a still larger number might have been dispersed in the neighboring chambers and galleries and there received the Bread of Life, brought to them by the assistant priests and deacons.” (Northcote and Brownlow). Painting rather than sculpture was followed among the liberal arts by the early Christians; not so much, perhaps, because the latter tended more to sensual forms in representing the human body, as on account of the greater difficulty of working in stone without being detected by the heathens. Images of the Blessed Virgin are not uncommon in the Roman catacombs. De Rossi has published a special work on this group or school of paintings. They are particularly found in the catacomb of Saint Priscilla. This is one of the most ancient of all the catacombs; in fact it is of apostolic origin and intimately connected with Saint Peter. The style of these fresco paintings is equal to the best found in the Baths of Titus (which were studied fifteen hundred years afterwards by Raphael), and in the ruins of Pompeii. Judged with impartial criticism, from the standpoint of art, they must date from the first century of our era. Looked at in their topographical position and archæological connection, they are as certainly found to be of apostolic date, and may have been executed under the supervision of the Apostle himself. Interesting paintings of the Blessed Virgin Mary represent her in the Roman catacombs at the Annunciation, with the prophet Isaiah pointing to a star above her head; at the adoration of the magi; standing with outstretched arms—as an *Orante*—in the attitude of prayer interceding for us, her children. How art, painting and sculpture, although working at such disadvantage in the catacombs, was used by the Church and made her handmaid in teaching the faithful through their senses, is nowhere, perhaps, so clearly perceived, as in the variations of the type of our Lord represented in the character of the Good Shepherd. For instance, after the second century, precisely the one in which certain heretics denied the power of the Church to absolve from certain crimes, the Good Shepherd is shown in the

act of carrying, not a lamb upon his shoulders, but a *goat*: type of the gross sinner. In other representations we see the Good Shepherd between a sheep and a goat, the latter animal occupying the place of honor, on his *right*, as if to recall to the minds of the faithful the general doctrine—then attacked by the Montanists—that there was no sinner but could, if repentant, obtain forgiveness; and also to allude specifically to this text of Saint Luke, “There shall be joy in heaven upon one sinner that doth penance, more than upon ninety-nine just, who need not penance. (xv., 7). The time and the occasion of such a painting and the extreme care with which these Christian artists worked under hieratic directions, precludes the possibility of a mistake here and an intention to represent the Judgment, when, as our Lord says, the sheep shall be on his right and the goats on his left (Matthew xxv., 33). Let us in conclusion recall, in connection with the catacombs, the humanizing influence of the Catholic Church. The servile or freedman’s condition of the dead was always jealously noted by the pagans; but only six out of eleven thousand Christian sepulchral inscriptions mention the deceased as having been a slave. Again, whereas the pagans with proud exclusiveness rejected the servile or the enfranchised from contact with the free-born even in death, the Christians buried all in the same place and in the same company. A few years ago there was discovered among the plainest and poorest graves—*loculos*—that of the wife of a Roman senator.

RELIGION IN EDUCATION.

I.

CHURCH schools exist because sincere members of every Christian denomination hold religion to be an essential element of education. These Christian members are convinced that they would be guilty of a gross breach of duty were they to neglect this important element in the training of their children. And they are right. Any system of education from which religious training is eliminated were inadequate and incomplete and therefore an injustice to the child receiving it. Education should develop the whole man. Intellect and heart, body and soul, should all be cultivated and fitted to act, each in its own sphere, with most efficiency. And so, the inculcation of piety, reverence and religious doctrine is of more importance than training in athletic sports or mathematical studies. Moreover, other things being equal, that is the best education which gives man, so to speak, the best orientation: which most clearly defines his relations with society and with his Creator; which imparts the all-important truths concerning his origin and his destiny, and points out the way by which he may best attain the end for which he was created.

Now it is only religious teaching that can furnish man with this information, and it is only in religious observances that man can best attain the aim and purpose of all life and promote the interests of society. Neither ancient nor modern philosopher has found a better solution for the enigma of life than is to be found in religion. Plato could never imagine such a monstrous state of affairs as education without religion. "All citizens," says this philosopher, "must be profoundly convinced that the gods are lords and rulers of all that exists, that all events depend upon their word and will, and that mankind is largely indebted to them."¹ We Christians are no less convinced that religion is as essential to men to-day as it was in the days of Plato. Nations cannot live without its vitalizing energy. It is the conservative element of states, of literature and of civilization. Indeed, we may affirm without fear of being gainsaid, that all civilization is rooted in religious worship, has grown out of the practices of religious worship, and has ever been fostered by religious worship. Does not the same word—*cultus*—apply to both? Prayer, which is a primary element of all worship, accompanied every important act undertaken by the pagans

¹ De Legg, iv, p. 288, cf. *De Repub.*, iv., p. 716.

of old. "The Greeks," we are told, "opened all public assemblies, campaigns, combats and public games, even the theatre, with prayer."¹

Christianity has in many respects changed man's point of view. The pagans made trees and flowers the habitations of gods and goddesses and earth-born spirits. Their conception of nature was pantheistic. Christianity threw a halo of tenderness and poesy of another kind, over the animal and vegetable kingdoms of nature. Its Divine Founder wove the lilies of the field and the vines on the hill-side into his discourses. Christian monks made smiling gardens and flourishing cities out of dense forests and barren deserts. Christian meekness taught men to look upon every creature of God as good. A St. Anthony tames the wild beasts of the desert; a Francis of Assisi sings a hymn to his brother the Sun, and exhorts all Nature animate and inanimate to love and give thanks to God; a Francis de Sales makes homilies upon the habits of bird and beast and insect; a Wordsworth recognizes this material universe as a symbol of the higher spiritual world.

The Christian aspect of the individual is no less distinct from the pagan aspect. In the ancient civilizations the individual was absorbed in the State. The State was the Supreme tribunal that decided all doubts and regulated conscience and conduct. Christianity reversed all this. It flashed the white light of revealed truth upon man's nature, lighting up its intricacies, and giving deeper insight into the secret chambers of the human heart; it taught man his personal dignity and his sense of responsibility; it showed him the temporal and the eternal in their proper relations; it brought home to him the infinite price of his soul, and thus led him up to a recognition of individual rights and liberties that were unknown in ancient Greece and Rome.

We may trace many of our laws and customs to pagan days, but in all that is good in our thinking, in our literature, in our whole education, there is a spirit that was not in the thought, the literature and the education of pagan people. We cannot rid ourselves of it. We cannot ignore it if we would. The enemies of Christianity in attempting to lay down lines of conduct and establish motives and principles of action to supersede the teachings of the Gospel and the practices of the Church, are forced to assume the very principles they would supersede. The Christian spirit has so entered into the acts and feelings and opinions of life that it is impossible to separate it from the purely natural. Christian sentiment, Christian modes of living, Christian opinion may not always be followed, but they are invariably the ultimate criterion—

¹ Hettinger, *Natural Religion*, p. 262.

the final tribunal before which action and expression are tried and judged. Speaking of this Christian influence Mr. Mallock says : " Its actual dogmas may be readily put away from us ; not so the effect which these dogmas have worked during the course of centuries. In disguised forms they are around us everywhere ; they confront us in every human interest, in every human pleasure. They have beaten themselves into life ; they have eaten their way into it. Like a secret sap, they have flavored every fruit in the garden. They are like a powerful drug, a stimulant that has been injected into our whole system."¹ Here, let it be remarked, lurks the fallacy of those who would regulate conduct without religion. Their ideal of life is still the Christian ideal without the Christian soul—the vital principle—that made that ideal an actuality. In thought and in external conduct they cannot rid themselves of that ideal. It is bred in the bone ; it is part of themselves.

II.

And so, our modern civilization, look at it how we will, is Christian in its nature and in its essence. It is based upon Christian laws and Christian practices. It is permeated by a Christian spirit. Christian sentiment has moulded public opinion and created the public conscience. In the Christian code of ethics do the sanctity of marriage and the rights of property find their firmest support. Even where this Christian spirit is least apparent it is still active. John Stuart Mill attempted to minimize the nature and extent of this influence. He considered himself outside its pale, but he could not help recognizing its power in those to whom it was a living presence, while contrasting its possible efficacy with what he considers its present lack of efficacy. " To what an extent," he says, " doctrines intrinsically fitted to make the deepest impression upon the mind, may remain in it as dead beliefs, without being ever realized in the imagination, the feelings, the understanding, is exemplified by the manner in which the majority of believers hold the doctrines of Christianity."² Mill is here ignoring the purely natural element that enters into human actions. It has not occurred to him that men may apparently lead ordinary lives and yet the Christian spirit may be operating in them most heroically. He takes no cognizance of the supernatural life, which is with rare exceptions beyond human ken. John Stuart Mill was himself carefully guarded against religious faith of any kind. Read his " Autobiography," and tell me if you know a sadder book in the whole range of letters. Note the gloom that overshadows every page. See how a naturally rich and fertile nature was

¹ *Is Life Worth Living*, p. 97.

² *On Liberty*, p. 79.

cramped and crushed into a groove in which half its energies were paralyzed. There hover throughout the book darkness and confusion concerning right and wrong and moral responsibility that are appalling. Even Mill, in the very deference he paid to public opinion in his conduct, was unconsciously doing homage to the Christian faith that moulded that opinion in England.

Men may now speculate as to what the actual state of the world would be had Christianity not entered as a disturbing element deflecting human progress from its former course. Such speculations are safe. The work is done. The barbarian who despised Roman civilization and sought its destruction has been Christianized; his fierce nature has been curbed and tamed; he has been raised up into a plane of culture and refinement, and imbued with an ideal of life that no formative influence outside of Christianity could have given him. If there still crops out traces of our heredity from the barbarian, and crime is rampant, this is no part of Christianity. It is rather in spite of Christian influence. Were men to live up to the perfection of the Sermon on the Mount, were they to seek first the Kingdom of God and His justice, they would still be possessors of all that is good in our modern civilization without the misery and crime that now fester at its door. Grace does not destroy nature. Human nature at all times and under all circumstances remains prone to evil. Civilization, considered in itself, only places more effective weapons in the hands of the criminal. It is a natural good, and as such is subject to the accidents of every natural good; therefore to evil; therefore to abuse; therefore to crime. Far from being an antidote to vice and crime, it may promote the one and the other, and civilization not unfrequently does so in creating new and expensive wants, increasing man's capacity for enjoyment, and so feeding selfishness as to render concupiscence all the more intense for being the more refined. Here lies the fallacy of unscrupulous and hard-headed Bernard Mandeville in his "Fable of the Bees." What is of accident he mistook for the essence of civilization.¹

Civilization, then, possesses in itself certain elements of disintegration. But in Christianity there is a conservative force that resists all decay. Christian thought, Christian dogma, and Christian morals never grow old, never lose their efficiency with the advance of any community in civilized life. John Stuart Mill is not of our opinion. To his mind the world would have got on all the better were there no Christian religion. He has to revert to the Korân to find civic virtue inculcated. He considers the character of Christian morality to be negative rather than positive. It

¹ Berkeley refutes several of Mandeville's fallacies in his *Alciphron*.

set up, according to him, "a standard of ethics, in which the only worth, professedly recognized, is that of obedience." In this patronizing fashion does he summarize his judgment; "That mankind owes a great debt to this morality and its early teachers, I should be the last person to deny; but I do not scruple to say of it, that it is in many important points incomplete and one-sided, and that unless ideas and feelings not sanctioned by it had contributed to the formation of European life and character, human affairs would have been in a worse condition than they now are."¹ Evidently John Stuart Mill never grasped the sublime scope and meaning of the Christian religion. Has he never learned that that religion is not concerned with the material side of our civilization? Its mission is chiefly to the spiritual side of man. Its aim is to establish the Kingdom of God in the human soul. It does not attempt to destroy man's natural talents and capacities; it takes these things for granted and seeks to control their use only through his conscience.

By the side of Mill's inadequate estimate of Christianity, let us place another from one who has cast from him the last shred of religious dogmas. Mr. Lecky in a more enlightened spirit bears witness to the perennial character of Christianity as a conservative force. "There is," he says, "but one example of a religion which is not naturally weakened by civilization, and that example is Christianity. . . . But the great characteristic of Christianity, and the great moral proof of its divinity, is that it has been the main source of the moral development of Europe, and that it has discharged this office, not so much by the inculcation of a system of ethics, however pure, as by the assimilating and attractive influence of a perfect ideal. The moral progress of mankind can never cease to be distinctively and intensely Christian, as long as it consists of a gradual approximation to the character of the Christian Founder. There is indeed nothing more wonderful in the history of the human race than the way in which that ideal has traversed the lapse of ages, acquiring a new strength and beauty with each advance of civilization, and infusing its beneficent influence into every sphere of thought and action."² This is unstinted praise; here is at least one chapter of the world's history that Mr. Lecky has not misread.

Thus is it that even according to the testimony of those who are not of us, our modern civilization has in it a unique element, divine and imperishable in its nature, growing out of its contact with the Christ. That characterizing element is Christianity. Individuals may repudiate it, but as a people we are still proud to

¹ *Essay on Liberty*, p. 94.

² *Rationalism in Europe*, i., pp. 311, 312.

call ourselves Christians. We have not come to that pass at which we are ashamed of the cross in which St. Paul gloried. The teachings and practices of Christianity form an essential part of our education. They are intimately blended with our whole personal life. Christian influences must needs preside over every important act from the cradle to the grave. So the Church thinks, and she acts accordingly. The new-born infant is consecrated with prayer and ceremonial to a Christian line of conduct when the saving waters of baptism are poured upon its head; the remains of the Christian are laid in the grave with other prayer and ceremonial. At no time in the life of man does the Church relax in her care of him. Least of all is she disposed to leave him to himself at that period when he is most amenable to impression and when she can best lay hold upon his whole nature and mould it in the ideal that is solely hers. Therefore is the Church ever jealous of any attempt on the part of secularism to stand between her and the child she has marked for her own with the sign of salvation through baptismal rites. She knows no compromise; she can entertain no compromise; she has no room for compromise, for she has never had a moment's indecision on the matter of education.

III.

Secularism in education has assumed many phases. We shall dwell upon a few of the theories proposed to supersede religious training in the schools. M. Ernest Renan has aired his views upon education. It goes without saying that M. Renan excludes what he calls theology as an educational factor. He will have none of it. He asks us to witness the ages that were under the sway of churchmen and theologians, and note the little progress they made in science, forgetting the barbarous character of his ancestors when they first came under Christian influences, forgetting also the slow process by which a people is reformed, refined, civilized. He would ignore the fact that these ages are an intermediate link between barbarism and our present enlightenment. Were it not for those theological times which M. Renan now looks down upon, even he would to-day be utterly incapable of making his fine phrases. Now, M. Renan divides all educational responsibility between the family and the State. He considers the professor competent to instruct in secular knowledge only. The family he regards as the true educator. He asks: "This purity and delicacy of conscience, the basis of all morality, this flower of sentiment which will one day be the charm of man, this intellectual refinement sensitive to the most delicate shades of meaning—where may the child and the youth learn these things? Is it in lectures attentively listened to, or in books learned by heart? Not at all, gentlemen; these things

are learned in the atmosphere in which one lives, in the social environment in which one is placed; they are learned through family life, not otherwise. Instruction is given in class, at the lyceum, in the school; education is imparted in the home; the masters here are the mothers, the sisters."¹ True it is that the State is not competent to form conscience; no less true is it that the family is the great moulder of character. The sanctuary of a good home is a child's safest refuge. There he is wrapped in the panoply of a mother's love and a mother's care. This love and this care are the sunshine in which his moral nature grows and blossoms into goodness. The child, the youth blessed with a Christian home in which he sees naught but good example and hears naught but edifying words, has indeed much to be thankful for; it is a boon which the longest life of gratitude can but ill-requite. But M. Renan wants neither home nor child, Christian. He would establish a religion of beauty, of culture, indeed of anything and everything that is not religion. The refining and educating influence he means is the "eternally-womanly"—*das Ewige-Weibliche*—of Goethe. It is a sexual influence. It is a continuous appeal to the gallantry and chivalry of the boy-nature. This and nothing more. Is it sufficient as an educational influence? Without other safeguard the boy soon outgrows the deference and respect and awe that woman naturally inspires. That is indeed a superficial knowledge of human nature which would reduce the chief factor of a child's education to womanly influence unconsecrated by religion, unrestrained by the sterner authority of the father, the law, the social custom.

The child of a Christian home, where some member of the family is competent and willing to give him religious instruction regularly and with method, might attend a purely secular school without losing the Christian spirit. But these conditions obtain only in exceptional cases. What has M. Renan to say to the home in which the father is absorbed in making money and the mother is equally absorbed in spending that money in worldly and frivolous amusements, and the children are abandoned to the care of servants? And what has he to say of the home without the mother? And the home in which example and precept are deleterious to the growth of manly character? And then consider the sunless homes of the poor and the indigent, where the struggle for life is raging with all intensity; consider the home of the workingman, where the father is out from early morning to late at night, and the mother is weighed down with the cares and anxieties of a large family and drudging away all day long at

¹ La Reforme: *La Part de la Famille et de l'Etat dans l'Education*, p. 316.

household duties never done; to speak of home education and delicacy of conscience and growth of character among such families and under such conditions were a mockery. But M. Renan has as happy a facility in ignoring facts as in brushing away whole epochs of history.

There are others—Christian gentlemen at that—who would keep religion out of the school while relegating it to the family and the Church. The late revered Howard Crosby, in his last published utterance, says: "Religion is too sacred a thing to be committed for its teaching to the public official. It belongs to the fireside and the Church."¹ But why should the public official have any voice regarding the teaching of religion? Why should the State dictate what shall or shall not be taught? Even M. Renan hesitated to give the State any say in the matter of controlling education. However, since the State controls the disbursement of the people's money, collected solely for the purpose of carrying on good government, by all means let the State see to it that those who are paid out of the people's money to teach the people's children, be competent to perform their duties and that the subject-matter taught be such as shall not prevent the child from becoming a good and useful citizen. But let us never lose sight of the fact that the people do not belong to the State, and that the machinery we call the State is the servant of the people, organized to do the will of the people. Were we to witness a paid official of the State strutting about during his brief hour of authority, giving out his opinions as the law of the State, identifying the State with himself, we would smile in pity at the spectacle; but were we to witness the pronouncements of this poor egotist accepted seriously by any body of men as bearing the weight and authority of the State, because, forsooth, the man so speaking happens for the moment to be stamped with the official seal of the State, then indeed were there a sight at which angels might weep with reason. Then might we tremble lest the spirit that gave life and being to our republic were fast receding from the body politic. A great monarch might say without injury to his dignity, "I am the State;" but it is blasphemy and political heresy, rank and odious in the nostrils of any intelligent citizen, to hear any fellow-citizen of a free State give his personal opinions all the weight and force that attach to the laws of the State.²

And here, while defending the State against any usurpation of its power, let us also assert the right of the parent. The parent has no intention of abdicating his right to educate the child. The

¹ *Educational Review*, May, 1891, p. 445.

² A careful reading of the Educational Report of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, for 1890, will make evident the meaning of these remarks.

right is his; he means to hold it. If he educates his child himself, all well and good. School laws are not made for the parent who educates his own child. If he does not himself educate the child, it is for him to say who shall replace him in this important function. In making this decision, the Christian parent is generally guided by the Church. The Church is pre-eminently a teaching power—that teaching-power extending chiefly to the formation of character and the development of the supernatural man. Her Divine Founder said: “All power is given to Me in heaven and on earth; going, therefore, teach all nations.” The Church holds that of all periods in the life of man, the period of childhood and youth, when the heart is plastic and character is shaping, and formative influences leave an indelible impress, is the one in which religion can best mould conduct and best give color to thought; and therefore the Church exhorts and encourages the Christian parent to make many and great sacrifices in order to procure a Christian education for his children. It is the natural right of every Christian child to receive this education. It is the natural right and bounden duty of the parent by the two-fold obligation of the natural law and the divine law, to provide his child with this education. And the right being natural it is inalienable; being inalienable, it is contrary to the fundamental principles of justice to attempt to force upon the child any other form of education, or to hinder the child in the pursuit of this education, or to impose upon the child a system of education that would in the least tend to withdraw him from the light and sweetness of the faith that is his inheritance. “Compulsory education,” says the eminent and fair-minded churchman, Cardinal Manning, “without free choice in matters of religion and conscience is, and ever must be, unjust and destructive of the moral life of a people.”¹ It is a breach of the social pact that underlies all State authority. That pact calls for the protection of rights, not for their violation or usurpation. And so, if the Christian parent would give his child a Christian education, there is no power on earth entitled or privileged to stand between him and the fulfilment of his wish.

But we are told that the child may learn the truths of his religion in Sunday-school and that religion is too sacred a thing for the school-room. Can you imagine an hour or two a week devoted to the most sacred of subjects at all in keeping with the importance of that subject? Can you imagine a child able to realize the power, the beauty, the holiness of religion from the fact that he is required to give only an hour or two out of the whole seven times twenty-four hours of the week to learn its truths?

¹ *The Forum*, March, 1887, p. 66.

Again let us quote the same eminent authority whose words will bear more weight with them than any we could utter: "The heartless talk," says Cardinal Manning, "about teaching and training children in religion by their parents, and at home, and in the evening when parents are worn out by daily toil, or in one day in seven by Sunday-schools, deserves no serious reply. To sincere common sense it answers itself,"¹ "Heartless talk . . . deserves no serious reply"—hard words these; but their fitness is all the more apparent the more we study the question.

The Church, who is, above all, the mother and protectress of the poor, sets her face against any such arrangement, and insists that wherever possible her children—especially her poor children—shall have a religious training. She makes it binding upon the consciences of Christian parents. They are not free as regards the character of the education they should provide for their children. Believing, as every Christian parent does, that man is created for a supernatural end, that that end can be attained in a Christian community only through a knowledge of Christian truths and the practice of Christian virtues, naught remains for him but to see to it that his child has the advantage of this Christian education, given by teachers who can inculcate these truths and instil the practice of these virtues. The Church alone is competent to pronounce upon the teachers and guarantee their accuracy in the matter of faith and morals. Here is how the Christian Church enters as an essential factor into Christian education.

Religion is sacred, and because it is so sacred a thing it should not be excluded from the school-room. It is not a garment to be donned or doffed at will. It is not something to be folded away carefully as being too precious for daily use. It is rather something to be so woven into the warp and woof of thought and conduct and character, into one's very life, that it becomes a second nature and the guiding principle of all one's actions. Can this be effected by banishing religion from the school-room? Make religion cease to be one with the child's thoughts and words and acts—one with his very nature—at a time when the child's inquisitiveness and intellectual activity are at their highest pitch; cause the child to dispense with all consciousness of the Divine Source of light and truth in his thinking; eliminate from your text-books in history, in literature, in philosophy, the conception of God's Providence, of His ways and workings, and you place the child on the way to forget, or ignore, or mayhap deny that there is such a Being as God and that His Providence is a reality. The child is frequently more logical than the man. If the thought

¹ National Education: *The School Rate*, p. 28.

of God, the sense of God's intimate presence everywhere, the holy name of Jesus, be eliminated from the child's consciousness and be forbidden his tongue to utter with reverence in prayer during school-hours, why may not these things be eliminated outside of school-hours? Why may they not be eliminated altogether? So may the child reason; so has the child reasoned; and therefore does the Church seek to impress upon it indelibly the sacred truths of religion in order that they may be to it an ever-present reality.

Not that religion can be imparted as a knowledge of history or grammar is taught. The repetition of the Catechism or the reading of the Gospel is not religion. Religion is something more subtle, more intimate, more all-pervading. It speaks to head and heart. It is an ever-living presence in the school-room. It is reflected from the pages of one's reading-books. It is nourished by the prayers with which one's daily exercises are opened and closed. It controls the affections; it keeps watch over the imagination; it permits to the mind only useful and holy and innocent thoughts; it enables the soul to resist temptation; it guides the conscience; it inspires a horror for sin and a love for virtue. The religion that could be cast off with times and seasons were no religion. True religion may be likened to the ethereal substance that occupies interstellar space. This substance permeates all bodies. There is no matter so compact that it does not enter, and between the atoms of which it does not circulate. Even so should it be with religion. It should form an essential portion of our life. It should be the very atmosphere of our breathing. It should be the soul of our every action. We should live under its influence, act out its precepts, think and speak according to its laws as unconsciously as we breathe. It should be so intimate a portion of ourselves that we could not, even if we would, ever get rid thereof. This is religion as the Church understands religion. Therefore does the Church foster the religious spirit in every soul confided to her, at all times, under all circumstances, without rest, without break, from the cradle to the grave. Place yourself, at this point of view, and say, if believing all this, child of yours should receive any other than a religious education.

We may have too little religion; we may be too sparing in giving to prayer and communion with God only a few hasty moments morning and evening; we may grudge Him an occasional reverential thought during our waking hours; we may ignore our dependence on Him; we may forget to thank Him for the natural blessings of life and health and the supernatural blessing of grace and redemption; but we never can become too deeply imbued with these and other sentiments that make up the religious spirit. That

were an inadequate and an unworthy conception of God that would represent Him as growing weary of our importunity in prayer and aspiration. There is much truth in the words of Ruskin: "We treat God with irreverence by banishing Him from our thoughts, not by referring to His will on slight occasions. His is not the finite authority or intelligence which cannot be troubled with small things. There is nothing so small but that we may honor God by asking His guidance of it, or insult Him by taking it into our own hands; and what is true of the Deity is equally true of His Revelation. We use it most reverently when most habitually; our insolence is in ever acting without reference to it; our true honoring of it is in its universal application."¹ The God of the Christian is an infinite, a personal, and a loving God. Surely no father among a Christian people, having at heart the welfare of son or daughter, would allow either to grow to the estate of manhood or womanhood without having ever bent the knee in prayer before that infinite, personal, and loving God, or without having learned and become imbued with any of the great fundamental truths of Christianity. Surely no man understanding human nature, and having at heart the good of society, would advocate that the rising generation should be brought up without any religious form of belief.

IV.

Even our secularists,—those of them the most radical,—while not believing in the intrinsic worth of religion or morality, would still uphold them both to a certain extent, not because they regard them as true, but because they consider them wholesome fictions for the people. Strauss, who had spent a long and laborious life in undermining the religion of Christ, while claiming for individuals the right to accept or reject all forms of belief, recognizes now, and far into the future, the necessity of a Church for the majority of mankind. "*We do not for a moment,*" he says, "*ignore the actual, and still for a long time the prospective, necessity of a Church for the majority of mankind;* whether it will remain thus to the end of human affairs, we regard as an open question; but we regard as a prejudice the opinion which deems that every individual must belong to a church, and that he to whom the old no longer suffices must join a new one."² He who believed neither in a church nor in a God, who would dry up the sources of all consolation in this life, and shut out every glimpse of hope for the life to come, still considered what from his point of view was a myth and an illusion, a necessity for the well-being of society. And Renan has expressed a similar opinion in regard to morality. While denying its obli-

¹ *Selections*, p. 404.

² *The Old Faith and the New*, pp. 116, 117.

gations he acknowledges its necessity. "Nature," he says, "has need of the virtue of individuals, but this virtue is an absurdity in itself; men are duped into it for the preservation of the race."¹ This mode of reasoning will never do. If religion and morality are merely a delusion and a snare, then had they better not be. You cannot gather grapes from thorns. You cannot sow a lie and reap truth. Think of all that is meant by such statements as these. Can you imagine a Commonwealth erected upon falsehood, or deceit entering into the very fabric of the universe? It is all implied in the assumptions of Renan and Strauss. Teach a child that religion and morality are in themselves meaningless, though good enough for the preservation of society, and you sow in his heart the seeds of pessimism and self-destruction.

Then, there are those who, believing in religion and morality, still maintain, in all sincerity, that these things may be divorced in the school-room. Dr. Crosby, in the article already quoted, says: "While I thus oppose the teaching of religion in our public schools, I uphold the teaching of morality there. To say that religion and morality are one is an error. To say that religion is the only true basis of morality is true. But this does not prove that morality cannot be taught without teaching religion."² It proves nothing else. The distinction between religion and morality is fundamental. But, be it remembered, that we are now dealing with Christian children, having Christian fathers and mothers who are desirous of making those children thoroughly Christian. Now, you cannot mould a Christian soul upon a purely ethical training. In practice, you cannot separate religion from morality. A code of ethics will classify one's passions, one's vices, one's virtues, one's moral habits and tendencies, but it is quite unable to show how passion may be overcome or virtue acquired. It is only from the revelation of Christianity that we learn the cause of our innate proneness to evil; it is only in the saving truths of Christianity that we find the meaning and the motive of resisting that tendency. Let us not deceive ourselves; the morality that is taught apart from religious truth and a religious sanction is a delusion. "It will be difficult," says Professor John Bascom, with more reason than Dr. Howard Crosby, "it will be difficult, if not impossible, to separate vigorous moral influences from the spiritual inspiration with which they are associated in the community, and to employ them effectively in this mutilated form."³

This follows from man's very nature and constitution. Man is not a pure intelligence. He has feeling and impulse as well as reason, and not unfrequently is reason carried away by feeling and

¹ *Dialogues Philosophiques*, intro, xiv.-xvii.

² *Ibid.*

³ *The Forum*, March, 1891, p. 60.

impulse. Merely to know the right does not always lead to the doing of it. Action requires more powerful motives than those arising from knowledge; motives, the root of which lie far beyond the domain of reason. "We cannot doubt," says Lord Bacon, "that a large part of the moral law is too sublime to be attained by the light of nature; though it is still certain that men, even with the light and law of nature, have some notions of virtue, vice, justice, wrong, good and evil."¹

Even religion, itself, when rationalized and reduced to a science, may cease to be vitalizing. The light and warmth have then passed out from it; its controlling influence upon the conscience has ceased; conduct, no longer guided by the still small voice of conscience, falls back upon reason, or prudence, or the instinct of self-preservation, or, mayhap, runs riot under the lash of passion and animal impulse. In the meantime, the individual may be making a thorough study of his religion. He may even have achieved a reputation as a theologian. The history of rationalism is strewn with wrecks of intellectual pride. These men illustrate the revolt of reason against religion. M. Ernest Renan is a case in point. A simple Catholic youth, holding as articles of faith all the truths taught by the Catholic Church, he enters upon a course of studies for the Catholic priesthood. He prays devoutly with his companions of the seminaries of Issy and St. Sulpice; he receives the sacraments with them; he follows all the spiritual exercises with them; and yet a day comes when he finds that he has lost the faith and is no longer a believer in revealed religion. Whence comes this to be so? The truths of religion are, many of them, distinct from natural truths; they are above natural truths, and yet they are based upon them. Faith supposes reason. Now, M. Renan has left us an amusing account of himself—M. Renan is amusing or nothing—and therein we learn that he began by sapping the natural foundations on which supernatural truth rests; he played fast and loose with philosophic truth, attempted to reconcile the most contradictory assumptions of Kant and Hegel and Schelling; he repudiated the primary principles of his reason, and so undermined its whole basis that it was no wonder to see the superstructure topple over. He, a boy of twenty, with very little strength of intellect, but with an overweening ambition that supplied all other deficiencies, sat in judgment upon all things in heaven and upon earth, especially upon the religion which he had professed and for the ministry in which he was preparing himself. From that moment, the Christian religion ceased to be for him an active principle. He no longer believed in the truths of Chris-

¹ *De Augmentis Scientiarum*, § 28.

tianity. While conforming to its external practices, the warmth and the life of it had vanished, and his active brain, having nothing else to feed upon, made of his religion a mere intellectual exercise, and finally, a marketable commodity, the means by which to create unto himself a name. He placed religious truth on the same footing with natural science, and tested both by the same methods. Naturally, truths that are deductive, based upon authority beyond the scope of reason, vanish into thin air when one attempts to analyze them as one would the ingredients of salt and water. They are effective only when received with reverence, submission, and implicit faith. In this manner did Renan's faith disappear before his intellectual pride. "In a scientific age," says Cardinal Newman, "there will naturally be a parade of what is called Natural Theology, a wide-spread profession of the Unitarian creed, an impatience of mystery, and a skepticism about miracles."¹

Now, if this intellectual temper is to be looked for under the most favorable auspices, what religious dearth may we not expect to find among young men out of whom all theological habits of thought have been starved, and in whom all spiritual life has become extinct? The school from which religious dogma and religious practices have been banished, is simply preparing a generation of atheists and agnostics. There is a large grain of truth in the remark of Renan, that, if humanity was intelligent and nothing else it would be atheistic. And yet, this man, whose views I find shadowy, shifting, panoramic, and unreal, this maker of clever phrases, would promote nothing but intellectual culture, soul-culture. "They are," he says, "not simple ornaments, they are things no less sacred than religion. . . . Intellectual culture is pre-eminently holy. . . . It is our religion."² Renan holds this culture sacred, because he hopes thereby to make men atheistic.

No; purely intellectual culture will not take the place of religion. Where men abandon themselves to the exclusive cultivation of the intellect; where they permit pursuits of any kind to monopolize their energies, to the neglect of the spiritual side of their natures, they are doing themselves an injustice. They are ignoring their supernatural destiny. They are making of themselves mere human machines for the performance of certain functions. They are missing the completeness of life for which they were created. Youth, trained on these lines, are putting themselves in a fair way to despise that which they have systematically neglected. Knowledge is, in itself, good; it is a great power; but

¹ *Idea of a University*, p. 226.

² *La Reforme*, pp. 309, 310.

knowledge is not all. With no less truth than aptness has the poet sung :

“ Make knowledge circle with the winds ;
But let her herald, Reverence, fly
Before her to whatever sky
Bears seed of men and growth of minds.”

But knowledge exclusively cultivated will lack this reverence. Knowledge is only too prone to puff up the unballasted mind. It supplies food for the intellect, gives it strength and development and aptitude upon definite lines. But the intellect works only according as the will directs. It is a pliant tool in the hands of the will. When the will is good, and operates towards right-doing, intellectual endowment is, indeed, a blessing ; when the will is depraved, a trained intellect becomes all the more mischievous. Reason enlightens the will and enables it to indicate motives ; but religion alone has the life-giving power that nerves and fires the whole life-energies of man for good. This has been the way of humanity in the past, and there is no reason why it should not be so in the future. Not, then, in intellectual culture may we find the proper substitute for religious training.

Nor yet in the culture of the æsthetic sense. Love of art in all its chief departments ; enthusiasm for music and poetry and the beautiful in life and conduct are one and all commendable. That the eye and the ear should be cultivated to their highest capacity, and that a sense of fitness and propriety should preside over all we do and all we say, are no less a gain. But that these things should be everything, that they should be the sole barriers erected against vice and crime, the sole motives of life, the sole criterion of conduct—is out of the question. Sense of beauty has never been able to stand between human selfishness and the gratification of any passion. When exclusively cultivated, its tendency is to render men and women rather effeminate and weak before temptation. In no country was art more thoroughly cultivated, or did art enter more intimately into all relations of life than it did in Greece ; but at no time in the history of Greece did men dream of substituting art-culture for religious prayer and ceremonial. Art is not an end. Every form of art is the expression of some idea ; every idea so expressed has grown out of a people's life. The meaning of all art worthy of the name consists in this, that it is the embodiment of the thought or motive that is calculated to elevate and ennoble one's conception of life, or action, or men, or things. Art is, then, a means making for a higher purpose. A good in its own way, when confined to its proper sphere, it is a source of enjoyment and one of the notes of civilization. But art in its highest form of expression has ever received its sublimest

inspirations from religion. The altar is the cradle at which music and dance, poetry and the drama, painting and sculpture and architecture have been nurtured and have grown in grace and beauty. With the decline of religious influence came the decline of each and all of these arts. Beauty cannot supplant virtue; it cannot stand on the same footing with virtue. Beauty is a natural gift pure and simple, whereas virtue is based upon man's free-will and grows out of man's relations with his Creator. Make the sense of beauty the ideal of life, and you may end in holding with Renan "that beauty is so superior, talent, genius, virtue itself, are naught in its presence"¹—a proposition bearing on the face of it its own refutation. Not in culture of the æsthetic sense is a substitute for religious training to be found.

Neither is the substitute to be found in that purely ethical culture which has in these days been made a religion. You cannot make such culture the basis of virtue. Is it virtue to recognize in a vague manner distinctions between right and wrong, or to know what is proper and graceful and becoming in conduct? By no means. As we have already seen, virtue is made of sterner stuff. The practice of virtue is based upon the dictates of conscience. Conscience has sanction in its recognition of the fact of a Law-giver to whom every rational being is responsible for his acts. What sanction has the moral sense as such? None beyond the constitution of our nature. We are told by the apostles of ethical culture that the supreme law of our being is to live out ourselves in the best and highest sense. But what is best and highest? If we consult only the tendencies of our poor, feeble, erring human nature, whither will they lead us? There are many things forbidden by the laws of Christian morality as injurious to the individual and destructive of society, that are looked upon as good by those who have drifted from the Christian faith. You may, under certain favorable circumstances, cultivate in the child a sense of self-respect that will preserve it from gross breaches of morality, but you are not thereby implanting virtue in its soul. Now the Christian parent, the Christian teacher, and the Christian clergyman, would see the soul of every child a blooming garden abounding in every Christian virtue. This is the source of all real social and personal progress.

There is no true moral improvement based upon purely ethical culture. Theory is not practice; knowing is not doing. The world was never renovated—the world would have never been renovated—by the ethical codes of Marcus Aurelius and Epictetus. The morality that enters into men's convictions, that becomes part of their very existence, that influences their lives and braces them

Continued.

¹ *Souvenir d'Enfance et de Jeunesse*, p. 115.

up to resist or forbear from wrong-doing under the most trying circumstances, has a higher source than the moral teaching that would make the beautiful in conduct the sole criterion of life. Ethical culture may veneer the surface, but it cannot penetrate to the depths of the human heart. It may point out the deformity of vice and the beauty of virtue; it may teach the proper and the becoming; it may create a sense of pride and honor that sustains the soul under certain forms of trial and temptation; under certain circumstances it may develop a certain manhood and womanhood of character; with a certain happy combination of traits in the natural disposition of the soul, it may lead to the practice of the natural virtues; but this is not the supernatural life of the Christian. This is not the ideal life laid down by St. Paul. The ideal of secularism considers only the pleasant and the agreeable; the fair and the proper are the secularists' chief objects of life. Virtue, from this point of view, is to be pursued as a matter of good taste, vice is to be avoided as something vulgar and ungentlemanlike. It is accompanied by a serene self-possession that aims to rise above blundering, a cold self-satisfaction that grows out of insensibility of conscience and a complete absence of the idea of sin. There are no probings of the heart; there are no self-accusings; there is no sense of sin; there is no humility; there is no spirit of faith, no solicitude for a future life. What has secularism in any of its phases to do with the saving of souls, or the fear of hell, or the doctrines of original sin, grace and redemption, or the theological virtues of faith, hope and charity, or with spiritual life, or the reign of the kingdom of God in human hearts? This is a world ignored or denied altogether by secularism. It has no place for the lesson that the cross comes before the crown, that men must sorrow before they can rejoice, that pain is frequently to be chosen before pleasure, that the flesh and the spirit are to be mortified, that passions are to be resisted and man must struggle against his inferior nature to the death. Now this doctrine is today as hard a doctrine as it was in the days of St. Paul, when men pronounced it a stumbling-block and foolishness. The Christian parent and the Christian Church are convinced that it is only by placing the Christian yoke upon the child in its tender years that the child will afterwards grow up to manhood or womanhood finding that yoke agreeable—for the Divine Founder of Christianity has assured us that His yoke is sweet and His burden light—and will afterwards persevere in holding all these spiritual truths and practices that make the Christian home and the Christian life a heaven upon earth. This is why Christian parents make so many sacrifices to secure their children a Christian education. This is why you find the world over, men and women—religious

teachers—immolating their lives, their comforts, their homes, their talents, their energies that they may cause Christian virtues to blossom in the hearts of the little ones confided to them. This is why, in the city of New York alone, we are witnesses, this very year, of not less than fifty-two thousand Catholic children, and in the whole State, not less than one hundred and forty thousand, attending our parish schools at great sacrifices for pastors and parents and teachers. The Church will always render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, but she will continue to guard and protect and defend her own rights and prerogatives in the matter of education. She cannot for a single moment lose sight of the supernatural destiny of man and of her mission to guide him from the age of reason towards the attainment of that destiny.

We know not how forcibly we have presented the plea for Church schools; but we do know that we have sought to give not mere individual impressions, but the profound convictions with which Christian parents act when insisting upon giving their children a Christian education. Therefore, sincere Christians, whether Catholic, Lutheran, Baptist or Episcopalian, be they named what they may, can never bring themselves to look on with unconcern at any system of education that is calculated to rob their children of the priceless boon of their Christian inheritance. Prizing their souls more than their bodies, they would rather see them dead than that their souls should be pinched and starved for want of the life-giving food that comes of Christian revelation and a Christian Church. Therefore it is that they cannot for a moment tolerate their children in an atmosphere of secularism from which Christian prayer and Christian practices have been banished. Some friends and admirers of Heraclitus, coming to see him, found him in the kitchen warming himself at the fire. He bade them enter, "for," he added, "God is also present in this place."¹ A noble thought, this of the pagan philosopher, that the presence of God dignifies the lowliest place. Even so thinks the Church. She holds that the presence of God, and the revelation of God, and devotion to God during school-hours, dignify and ennoble the studies and the very nature of the child. And every Christian parent is content to know that the school-room in which his child abides, is sanctified by the consciousness of our Saviour and Redeemer lighting up the knowledge that child is acquiring and nourishing his heart with beautiful Christian sentiments—the sense of God's presence within him and about him, and the voice of God speaking to his conscience, and thrilling his soul unto a music with which his whole life shall beat in unison.

¹ Aristotle, *De Partibus Animalium*, lib. i., cap. v., § 5.

THE SUPPRESSION OF THE TEMPLARS.

SOME authors have held that the first institution of military orders, particularly that of St. George, is to be ascribed to the emperor, Constantine; but it is generally conceded that the idea of chivalry was a fruit of the crusades, and that it originated at the close of the eleventh century¹. Like most of the institutions of the Middle Age, the idea of military orders came from the Church; it was her inculcation of religious devotion upon the soldier, even in the exercise of his profession, that gave birth to these organizations. As far back as the year 1022, in the time of the Fatimite caliphs, some Neapolitan merchants had established a hospital for pilgrims, under the patronage of St. John the Baptist, near the Holy Sepulchre. They assigned it to the care of certain religious who came to be known as Hospitalers. The rector of this institution was Gerald, a native of Scala, near Amalfi; he conceived the first idea of the Order of the Hospital of St. John, known in history, at first as Knights of St. John, then as Knights Hospitalers, afterward as Knights of Rhodes, and finally as Knights of Malta. Pope Paschal II. took the new order and its possessions under his protection; Calixtus II. conferred upon Raymond du Puy, the second provost, the title of Master, and he confirmed the statutes which Raymond had drawn up in 1104.

¹ It has been debated whether chivalry, as we fancy it, ever really existed, or whether it is not merely a pretty dream, like the Golden Age. If you read the authors of those days, says Cantu, "you will find them all lamenting the bygone time, and deploring the decay of chivalry. . . . We may well believe that the chivalry of the romances, that is, an era of valor, of loyalty, of spontaneous order, of happiness, of disinterested sacrifice, of chaste love, no more existed than did the idyllic blessedness of the Arcadian shepherds; but that books have modified it, and substituted an ideal era for the true one. Nevertheless, there was considerable reality in chivalry, and its members formed an efficient organization, with initiatory forms, rights and prerogatives. . . . In the time of the third crusade its reputation had become so great that even Saladin asked to be enrolled. Its principal theatre was the south of France, whence it spread into all Spain, already chivalrous by nature. . . . Italy, devoted to commerce, science and religion, cared little for the punctilios of chivalry, unless in Sicily, where it was introduced by the Normans. The Suabians wondered that the Hungarians possessed no chivalry, and they sent a message to them, praying in the name of woman that they would fight in a more courteous manner, that is, with the sword; they replied by scourging the envoy. . . . England, more aristocratic than chivalrous, shows us only Richard the Lion Heart, and he was formed to the arms and poetry of France; the heroes of the Round Table lived only in the pages of romance; Edward III. and the Black Prince arose only from contact with France. The Greeks and the Russians never knew the institutions of chivalry, but they penetrated into Poland."—*Universal History*, b. xi., ch. 4.

This order was composed of three classes of brethren,¹ namely, ecclesiastics, for spiritual matters; laics, for menial service; and knights, whose duty it was to protect pilgrims. In 1252, Innocent IV. gave to the head of the Hospitalers the title of Grand Master.²

Following the example of Gerald de Scala and Raymond Dupuy, two illustrious chevaliers named Hugh des Payens and Godfrey de St. Aldemar, with seven companions, founded in 1118, another military religious order which, taking its name from the temple of Solomon, near the site of which King Baldwin II. lodged the first knights, came to be known as the Order of the Temple. For nine years the Templars received no novices, and so poor were they, that one horse was made to serve for two knights; whence, says Matthew of Paris, originated the representation on the seal of the order. The Templars took, from the first, the ordinary religious vows, with a fourth, to protect pilgrims; but in 1128, St. Bernard composed for them a special rule which was both mystic and austere. The Templar swore to dedicate his life to warring against the infidels; to never decline battle unless the odds were more than three to one; to never ask for quarter; and to never give up, as ransom, "one piece of wall or one palm of land." St. Bernard wished the community-life of the knights to be frugal but pleasant; personal property there was none, and the will of the individual was to be merged in that of the superior. The divine office was, as a general thing, of obligation; but on occasions of military duty, private prayer was substituted. Thrice a week the members ate meat; two ate from one plate, but each had his own bottle of wine. When a knight died, his ration was given to the poor for forty days. Hunting, in the ordinary sense of the term, was forbidden; but the knights might kill ferocious wild beasts. They were never to be idle, said St. Bernard; when not on the march, their weapons and armor should claim their attention. Games, spectacles and buffoonery of every kind were prohibited to the Templar. Their horses should be spirited but plainly caparisoned. When battle was imminent, the knight should prepare cautiously for it, being armed within by faith and without with iron. He should charge the enemy with confidence, being secure of victory or of martyrdom. In every danger, continued the saint, the Templar should say to himself: "Living or dead, we belong to the Lord; glory awaits the conqueror, heaven the martyr." Though not so aristocratic an order as that of the

¹ From the French word *Frères* came our *friars*, and their name in every language. The Latin chroniclers style them *frerii*; the Greeks, *phreri*.

² *Lives of the Grand Masters of the Holy Order of St. John of Jerusalem*, by the Commander, Brother Jerome Marulli, Naples, 1636.

Hospital,¹ the Temple soon received among its votaries the scions of the first families of Christendom. From all parts of Europe the knights received money and provisions; few wills were made without clauses in their favor; many sovereign princes donned the white mantle. At the close of the twelfth century the wealth of the Templars was so great that their landed estates numbered nine thousand; in the kingdom of Valencia alone they owned seventeen fortified towns. Their riches and privileges soon engendered corruption, and thirty years after they had adopted his rule, St. Bernard was forced to say to them: "You cover yourselves and your horses with silk; you paint your lances; your shields, saddles, and spurs shine with gold, silver and gems; your flowing tresses impede your sight; your long trains interfere with your walk; fine gloves cover your delicate hands. Discord is rife among you because of unreasonable anger, of inordinate desire of glory, and of love of earthly riches." The jealousy of the Templars in regard to the Hospitalers was a chief cause of the loss of Palestine to Christendom. Instead of regarding every Islamite as an enemy, they entered into an alliance with the Old Man of the Mountain; they gave refuge to a fugitive sultan; they warred on the Christians of Cyprus and Antioch, devastated Greece, and refused to contribute to the ransom of St. Louis. Indeed, public accusations were made against the Templars long before the time of Clement V. William of Tyre charged them with disobedience to the patriarch of Jerusalem, and with disturbing the churches in their domains.² In 1200, King Leo I., of Armenia, complained to Pope Innocent III. that the knights had not only invaded his territories, but had refused to aid him in resisting the attacks of the infidels.³ Even Innocent III., who had given many privileges to the Templars, lamented, in 1218, that the knights "had no respect for the Apostolic See," and that "they merited to be deprived of privileges so fearfully abused."⁴ In 1244, Frederick II. charged the Templars with receiving Mussulman princes into their houses and with allowing Mohammedan rites in their cloisters; and he adds that they were given up to the pleasures of the world.⁵ Gurtler gives many instances of Templar avarice in circumstances when religion needed their assistance. It is not surprising, therefore, that after the loss of the Holy Land, the Templars were regarded as entirely useless. Nevertheless, like the Hospitalers, they would have been allowed to subsist had not the world been

¹ The Knights of the Hospital were obliged, before admission, to show a noble descent of four generations by both parents; the chaplains and servant-knights were also of noble birth, though not necessarily by four descents.

² *Deeds of God through the Franks*, vol. i.

³ In *Dupuy*, p. 137.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 141.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 152.

horrified by their crimes. "While the common people were frightened at these accusations, the great ones of the earth charged the Order with an aspiration for universal dominion; with the intention of founding an aristocratic republic which would embrace all Europe—a very improbable design on the part of knights entirely dependent on the will of a grand master. . . . Philip hated the Order because it had refused to enroll him as a member, and would not sign the appeal against Boniface VIII.; he hated it because he wanted its riches." Such is the judgment of Cantu in regard to the suppression of this Order, and many other historians of merit hold the same opinion. The object of the present paper is to show that the Order of the Temple deserved suppression; that, whatever may have been the motives which actuated Philip the Fair, Pope Clement V. performed his simple duty in putting an end to an organization which had survived its usefulness and had become a scandal to Christendom.¹

On the feast of the Annunciation, 1307, the Faculty of Paris, having been consulted by king Philip as to his powers in the premises, issued a doctrinal judgment, attested by the seals of fourteen doctors, in which it was declared, that unless requested by the Church, the secular magistracy could take no cognizance of the crime of heresy, or of the cause of a religious order or of its members; but that, in case of imminent danger, the accused might be arrested, and then given over to the custody of the Church.² In accordance with this decision, but not before October 13th, and

¹ The following are the principal works on this subject: 1. *The History of the Military Order of the Templars*, by Peter Dupuy, in 4to, Brussels, 1751. After one has read the many works that this suppression has called forth, he finds that he can come to no satisfactory conclusion, unless he examines the original documents. Hence he is grateful to Dupuy for the care with which, in 1650, he extracted many from the archives at Paris. 2. *The History of the Templars*, by Nicholas Gurtler, of Basel; Amsterdam, 1712; a work of some research but very hostile to the Church. 3. *A Critical and Apologetical History of the Knights of the Temple called Templars*, Paris, 1789; by M. J., a Premonstratensian canon; an enthusiastic, but not critical, apology for the order. 4. *An Essay on the Charges against the Templars*, by Fred. Nicolai; Amsterdam, 1783. Nicolai was a Protestant, but impartial and judicious. 5. *Historical Memoirs on the Templars*, by Grouvelle; averse to the Order, but unsatisfactory as to proofs. 6. *Historical Monuments Relative to the Condemnation of the Knights of the Temple*, by Raynouard; Paris, 1813; the best defence of the Templars ever attempted, but too much like the author's tragedy on the same subject which caused much excitement in France. 7. The excellent work of the Abbé Christopher, *The Papacy in the Fourteenth Century*, vol. i, b. 4; Paris, 1853. 8. The incomparable *Universal History of Cantu*, b. xiii., ch. 6. All the Acts of the Pontifical Commission in the cause of the Templars were published by Moldenhauer in 1791; and the statutes of the Order were edited in 1794 by the Danish author, Munter. In his *Collection of Unedited Documents Concerning the History of France* (Series 1, *Political History*), Michelet edited the *Process* of the Templars, of which Dupuy had given only extracts.

² Cited by Dupuy.

after the grand master had complained to the Pope (August 24th), and demanded a juridical process,¹ all the Templars in France were arrested. On the 14th the clergy of Paris, and on the 15th the people, were informed of the charges against the knights. Then William of Paris, of the Order of Preachers, and inquisitor-general in the kingdom, undertook the necessary investigations, and interrogated one hundred and forty knights of the house in Paris. From the Continuator of Nange and the *Acts* of this inquiry, taken from the Royal Archives in 1650 by Dupuy, we learn that the following were the accusations. 1. On their entrance into the order, the knights were commanded to deny Christ and to spit thrice upon the crucifix; if the novice hesitated, imprisonment and torture forced him to yield. 2. Obscene signs of submission were made to the preceptors by the candidates. (*Ad præceptum præceptoris, nec-non præceptorem ipsum—quod nominandum quasi turpissimum—inferius in posterioribus osculabantur immunde*). 3. Although they had foresworn the society of women, sodomy was a prevalent and permitted practice of the Templars. 4. They were in the habit of adoring an idol, in the shape of a golden head with a long beard and fiery eyes. According to Hammer, in his "Mystery of Baphomet Exposed," this head was called "the head of Baphomet." He says that he found twelve of these heads in the prison of Vienna, with Arabic, Greek, and Latin inscriptions entitling them *Metis* or Wisdom; hence he concludes that *Baphomet* is derived from *Baphimiteos*, which would mean a baptism of the spirit or of fire—a Gnostic or Ophitic idea. These superstitious signs, says Hammer, the Templars must have derived from their intercourse with the Ishmaelites, and they have been frequently found, he adds, in the houses and tombs of the knights. He declares that he himself discovered several in the Templar churches at Stenfeld and Wultendorf. Teleky, in his "Voyage in Hungary," says that the same figures are found in the Templar church of St. Martin, in Muran. As for the obscenities ascribed to the knights, Hammer credits the charges, because of the many obscene anaglyphs found in the houses and sepulchres of the order; and he comes to the conclusion that the principal members and a large number of the rest were guilty of apostacy, superstition and gross impurity.² 5. The priests of the

¹ This fact explodes the charge that the arrest was secret and unexpected.

² See Palma's *Lectures*, cent. xiv., c. 30, and Mignard's *Hidden Practices of the Templars*, Dijon, 1851. The latter work is a dissertation on a casket found in 1789 on the Essarois estate of the marquis du Chastenay. This casket is made of limestone, and is about 25 centimetres long and 20 wide. On it is an image in relief, which Mignard lithographed. The image is of a sort of masculo-feminine being, standing naked, wearing a crenulated crown, and holding in its hand a chain which is surmounted, on the right, by the moon, and on the left by the sun; at the feet of the image is a death's head, set in a star and a pentagon; Arabic characters surround the

Order were accustomed, when pretending to celebrate Mass, to omit the words of consecration.

Among the knights questioned as to the truth of these accusations, were the grand master, James de Molay; Guy, the brother of the dauphin of Auvergne; and Hubert de Perault. There were one hundred and forty in all, and only three of them pronounced the charges false. Some protested that they had long since repented of having joined the Order, and had asked Rome for a dispensation; others insisted that they had already confessed their crimes to episcopal penitentiaries. The inquisitor, William of Paris, afterward held an examination of one hundred and eleven Templars at Troyes, and although these knights denied the adoration of the head of *Baphomet*, they admitted the truth of the other charges. At Caen, thirteen other knights admitted their guilt, when questioned by commissioners delegated by the inquisitor. At Pont de l'Arche, ten knights were interrogated by Peter de Hangest, governor of Rouen, with the same issue. At Carcassonne, John de Cassanhas, preceptor of the house of Noggarde, also confessed the alleged crimes. At Cahors, forty-four Templars admitted their guilt to the royal commissary. The *Acts* of all these inquiries were preserved, at least in Alexandre's time, in the royal archives, and had been diligently examined by Dupuy.

Pope Clement V. did not approve the high-handed measures of Philip the Fair in the affair of the Templars. He suspended the authority of the inquisition in France, and called the cause of the knights to the Holy See, requesting the king to surrender the persons and properties of the accused to the care of two cardinals deputed for that purpose. Indeed, so displeased was the Pontiff that he complained, eight months afterward, to the minister William Plasian, and declared that nothing could excuse the illegality of commencing so grave a prosecution without the consent of the Holy See.¹ Philip reluctantly complied with the papal request, and he sent many of the accused knights to Poitiers, where the Pontiff was residing, that Clement might himself inquire into their guilt. The Pope questioned seventy-two, and they all avowed the

main figure. There are also three other masculo-feminine figures. From the records of the Chastenay family it is proved that the property on which the casket was found was once that of the Templars; and we know that the important priory of Voulainelles-Temple was near Essarois. Following the interpretative systems of Nicolai and Hammer, Mignard finds a Gnostic meaning in the picture. In the Arabic inscription are found the *Ogdoagde* or Creator, and his seven *eones* or emanations; the fusion of the two sexes—the Gnostic *eones* were hemaphrodite; the denial of Christ: "If thou deniest, pleasure will environ thee." Basilides regarded this denial as the sign of true liberty; as to the sodomitic habits, the followers of Valentine and Basilides were addicted to such vices. This chest, concludes Mignard, reveals the key of the *Cabal*, with which the Templars were reproached, and proclaims infamous mysteries.

¹ Baluze, vol. i., p. 29.

crimes charged by the French inquisitor. We present the following rather lengthy extract from the diploma of Clement V. to the king, commencing with the words "Reigning in Heaven," as it throws much light on this entire subject.

"Some time ago, when we were first promoted to the height of the pontificate, and even before we went to Lyons, where we were crowned, and after that, in other places as well as there, we received secret information that the master, preceptors, and other brothers of the Temple, and even the Order itself, to which had been assigned the defence of the patrimony of our Lord Jesus Christ beyond the seas, had fallen into the horrible wickedness of apostasy against the same Lord, into the detestable crime of idolatry, into the execrable vice of the Sodomites, and into various heresies. But, taught by the example of our Lord, and by the doctrines of canonical Scripture, we wished not to lend our ear to such accusations; for, it seemed improbable, nay, incredible, that religious men who had shed their blood for Christ, and so often had exposed themselves to death for His sake, who had shown such signs of devotion in the divine offices, fasts, and other observances, should so far forget their salvation as to perpetrate such deeds. At length, however, you who had heard of these same iniquities, and moved, not by avarice—for you do not intend to claim or appropriate the property of the Templars, but have taken your hands altogether away from it, freely and devoutly yielding it up to us and to the Church, to be guarded and administered by our deputies—but excited by zeal for the orthodox faith, and following in the footsteps of your ancestors, having informed yourself, so far as you could, sent to us by messengers and letters many and extensive reports on these matters. Meanwhile, the infamy attaching to the Templars was becoming widespread, and we ourselves heard from a certain knight of the Order—a man of high nobility, and who was once of great influence in it, who swore to what he said, that a candidate to the Order, at the suggestion of the receiver or of his deputy, denied Jesus Christ; that he spat on a crucifix in contempt of Him crucified; that then, both candidate and receiver did things not befitting human decency; therefore, urged by the duty of our office, we were compelled to hearken to so many great complaints. Finally, we learned from public report, from you, and the dukes, counts, barons, and other nobles, as well as from the clergy and people of your kingdom, what we announce with great grief, that the master, preceptors, and members of the said Order, and the Order itself, had been charged with the aforesaid and other crimes, and that the premises seemed to be proved by many confessions, attestations and depositions of the said master, preceptors, and members of the said Order, made before many prelates and the French in-

quisitor into heretical depravity, and shown unto us and our brethren. Since then, the aforesaid rumors and clamors have so increased against the Order, and against each and every one of its members, that they cannot be disregarded without grave scandal, nor tolerated without imminent danger: We, following in the footsteps of Him, whose place, although unworthy, we hold on earth, deemed it proper to inquire into the aforesaid things. Having called into our presence many of the preceptors, priests, soldiers, and other brothers of the said Order, men of no light reputation, and they having sworn to tell us the simple and full truth in the premises, we interrogated and examined seventy-two of their number, many of our brethren diligently assisting. Their confessions were reduced to authentic writing, and were read in our presence and that of our brethren. After a few days we caused these avowals to be read in the Consistory, and before the accused, and to be explained in the vernacular of each one. Persevering in their confessions, they all, expressly and voluntarily, approved of them as they were read."

The Pontiff then recites how he had proposed to personally interrogate the grand master, and the preceptor of Normandy and others, but some of them being infirm and unable to travel, he had decided to take other means to discover whether they admitted the truth of the confessions made before the French inquisitor.

"Therefore," he continues, "we commissioned our beloved sons, the cardinals Berengarius of the Title of Sts. Nereus and Achilleus, and Stephen of the Title of St. Cyriacus *in thermis*, priests, and the cardinal-deacon Landulph, of the title of St. Angelus, of whose prudence, experience, and fidelity we are sure, to diligently inquire from the aforesaid master and preceptors into the charges made against the members of the Order and against the Order itself, and to report to us whatever they could discover, referring also to us the confessions, reduced to writing by public authority, conceding to them also the power to confer upon the said master and preceptors absolution from the excommunication which they had incurred, if the accusations were true, providing that they, as they ought to do, humbly and devoutly besought that absolution. These cardinals interviewed the master and preceptors, and explained the reason of their coming. And as *the persons and goods of all the Templars of the kingdom were in our hands*, the cardinals declared to them, by the Apostolic authority, that they might open their minds freely and without fear. Then, the master, and the preceptors of France, of the lands beyond the seas, of Normandy, Aquitaine, and Poitiers, having touched the Holy Gospels of God, swore that they would tell the full and simple truth before the three cardinals, in presence of four public no-

taries, and of many other public men. Before these, each one freely and voluntarily, without any coercion or fear, deposed and confessed: Among other things, to the denial of Christ, and the spitting on the cross, when they were received into the Order of the Temple; and some of them said that they had received many brethren with the same form, namely, the denial of Christ and the spitting on the cross. Some, also, confessed certain horrible and indecent things, about which, that we may spare their shame, we keep silence. They also avowed the truth of the confessions made some time ago before the inquisitor into heretical depravity; and those confessions and depositions of the aforesaid master and preceptors, reduced to writing by four public notaries, in the presence of the said master and preceptors and of certain worthy men, after a few days were read to them, by order and in presence of the aforesaid cardinals, and explained to each one in his own vernacular. Persevering in them, they all expressly and voluntarily approved them, as they were read. And after these confessions and depositions, they all, upon their knees, and with clasped hands, and with no slight flow of tears, besought of the cardinals an absolution from the excommunication which, because of the aforesaid things, they had incurred. Then, the cardinals expressly, and according to the form of the Church, extended the benefit of absolution by our authority, for the Church does not close her bosom to the returning one. Coming, then, into our presence, the cardinals presented to us the confessions and depositions, and all that had happened in regard to the said master and preceptors; everything being reduced to writing by public authority. From which confessions, depositions, and relations, we find that the aforesaid master and preceptors were grievously delinquent in the aforesaid matters, although some in a greater and some in a less degree."

If any confidence is to be placed in the solemn assertions of a Roman Pontiff, we have now shown the truth of what we undertook to demonstrate, namely, that the Templars acknowledged their guilt of the terrible crimes with which they were charged. But more light will fall upon the subject if we notice the following facts: In October, 1310, a Council of the province of Sens was held, and, according to the Continuator of Nange, "a diligent inquiry was made into the deeds of the Templars, and into everything regarding them; and their demerits having been weighed, and their quality and circumstances considered, with the approval of the Sacred Council, and with the advice of men learned in the Divine and Canon Law, it was adjudged and defined, that some of them should be simply dismissed from the Order; certain others, however, having performed an enjoined penance, were allowed to depart free and unharmed; some were detained in close confinement;

and many, having relapsed into heresy, were delivered to the secular power."¹ Bzovius quotes a Vatican MS., from which it appears that the archbishops of Florence and Pisa made an inquiry into the charges against the Templars, embracing therein all Lombardy and Tuscany; and that it resulted in proving the accusations well founded. In England, says Walsingham: "By command of the king (Edward II.), all the Templars in the realm were arrested, because of imputed indecencies and enormities contrary to the Catholic faith."² Pope Clement V. appointed as judges for the trials in Edward's dominions, the patriarch of Jerusalem, the archbishop of York, the bishops of Lincoln, Chester, and Orleans; the abbots of Lagny and of St Germain, in Paris; Richard de Vaux, canon of Narbonne, and Guy de Vichy, a London pastor. In 1309, a Provincial Council was held at Canterbury for the consideration of this question, but we have no documentary evidence as to its result. But that the English Templars were condemned is evident from the process, as found in Wilkins; although it appears that the guilt of the English knights was less general than that of the continental brethren. We shall notice this fact more particularly when we come to consider the arguments adduced by the apologists for the Templars. In Aragon, as we are told by Zurita,³ there came from the French king, "on the 17th of the calends of November, 1307, an embassy, such as he had sent to all Christian princes, requesting each of them to undertake the defence of the Catholic faith in his own dominions against the Templars. The king received this request while residing in the royal castle of Valencia; and on the 3d of the nones of December he ordered the arrest of all those sectarians, and the sequestration of their property. John Lotger, of the Dominican Order, Apostolic inquisitor for the kingdom of Aragon, exercised the utmost severity in enforcing the law, repressing the guilty and their partisans. A large number of these shut themselves in the strong castles of Carthage, Montyon, Miravet, Villel, and Alfambra, hoping to escape the penalty following their indictments. In Catalonia, also, having no other hope, they acted in a similar manner. Then the king ordered them to be subdued by force." Pope Clement appointed the bishop of Valencia, the royal chancellor, as judge in the cause of all the accused Templars in Spain. We shall have occasion to notice the assertion that the Spanish Templars were pronounced

¹ At year 1310.

² *History of England*, Rymer, b. iii., nos. 30, 34, 43, 301.

³ Jerome Zurita (b. 1512) was historiographer of Aragon, and private secretary to the king. He wrote a collection of *Annals of the Crown of Aragon* (6 vols., fol., 1562-79), commencing with the rise of the kingdom and ending with Ferdinand the Catholic.

innocent of the alleged crimes;¹ but here we would remark that, according to Zurita, the knights were guilty of contumacy towards their legitimate judges, and of rebellion against their sovereign; which crimes, committed precisely because of the accusations brought against them, would indicate a consciousness of guilt.

All the above inquisitorial, pontifical, and episcopal *Acts*, as well as others of less importance,² were laid before the Fifteenth General Council, and in its second session, held on April 3, 1312, Pope Clement V., having preached a sermon on the text, "The wicked shall not rise again in judgment, nor sinners in the council of the just," and having adapted it to the existing circumstances of the Templars, promulgated the following decree: "With the approbation of the Sacred Council, and not without grief and bitterness of heart, by our ever-valid and irrefragable decree, not by means of a definite sentence, since we could not, according to the inquiries and processes held in the premises, so pronounce *de jure*, but by way of provision and Apostolic ordinance, we have abolished the Order of the Soldiers of the Temple of Jerusalem, and its state, name, and habit; because of the master and brethren and other persons of the said Order, residing in every part of the world, being stained with various and diverse not only wicked, but even unmentionable obscenities, depravities, and foulnesses, on which we are now silent because of their filthiness. We subject the said Order to perpetual prohibition, especially commanding that no one shall dare to enter the said Order, or to receive or wear its dress, or to present himself as a Templar. If any one does so, he incurs, by the very fact, excommunication. By our Apostolic authority we have decreed that all the property of the aforesaid Order be held at the disposition of the Apostolic See. With the approbation of the same Sacred Council, we give forever, concede, unite, incorporate, apply, and annex, out of the fulness of our Apostolic power, to the Order of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem, and to the Hospital itself, the house of the Soldiers of the Temple and all their other houses, churches, chapels, oratories, towns, castles, villas, lands, granges, possessions, jurisdictions, revenues, rights, all movable and immovable goods, with all their rights and appurtenances, on this side and beyond the sea, in any part of the world where they may be found whatever, at the time the master and certain knights of the Temple were arrested, that is, in the month of October of the

¹ The authors of the *Catholic Dictionary* say that "in Spain and Portugal the knights were put on trial on the same charges but honorably and enthusiastically acquitted."

² Such as the investigation in the province of Sens; that in the province of Ravenna; and that in Castile.

year of the Lord 1308, the said Order and the said master and brethren of the Soldiers of the Temple, either by themselves or others, held and possessed . . . excepting such goods of the late Order of the Soldiers of the Temple as are found outside of the realm of France, in the kingdoms and dominions of our beloved sons, the kings of Castile, Aragon, Portugal and Majorca; these we have deemed proper to especially except and exclude from the above donation, concession, union, application, incorporation, and annexation; reserving them, nevertheless, to the disposition of the Apostolic See."¹

With regard to the clause, "not by means of a definitive sentence, since we could not, according to the inquiries and processes held in the premises, so pronounce *de jure*," it is to be observed, that these words by no means imply a deficiency of power on the part of the Pontiff to abolish, definitely and *de jure*, any religious order or community whatever, when he deems such action conducive to the good of the Church. The only reason for the existence of any religious order or religious institution is the good of the Church; it is only by a decree of the head of the Church that a religious order attains a legal status, and only so long as he and his successors will that said decree shall retain its force, does that Order remain a legitimate organization. What then did Clement V. mean by the above clause? We must remember that the entire Order of Templars, as an order, had not been called to judgment;² that in some provinces, the Order, as such, had been acquitted. Hence the Pontiff deemed it proper to abolish the Templars, as Durand of Mende is said to have put it, not "according to the rigor of the law" by a definitive sentence, but "by the fulness of his power," by way of Apostolic ordinance. Raynald³ gives the testimony of one of the fathers of the Fifteenth Council, a "bishop conspicuous for piety and knowledge," whose name he omits, but whom Alexandre says many regarded as Durand of Mende, one of those delegated by Clement V. before the Council, to inquire into the cause of the Templars. This prelate informs us that in the process preliminary to the issue of the decree of abolition, some of the fathers thought that the Order ought not to be abolished without every observance of law, whereas others contended that it "should be destroyed without delay, both because of the grave

¹ The property of the Templars in the Iberian peninsula was afterward appropriated to defray the expenses of the Crusades against the Mohammedan invaders of that land.

² Those who undertook the defence of the knights before the Apostolic commissioners at Paris, declared that they possessed no legitimate "procuracy," and that they could not act as procurators without the commission of the grand master.

³ *Annals*, at year 1311, No. 55.

scandals said Order had furnished Christendom, and because more than two thousand witnesses had shown its guilt of error and heresy." The bishop himself deemed it "expedient for the Church of God and the Christian faith that the Pope, either by the strict letter of law (*de rigore juris*), or by the fulness of his power, should abolish that most infamous Order which, so far as it could, had rendered fetid the odor of the Christian name among the incredulous and the heathen, and had weakened the faith of some Christians . . . and without delay, I say, even though the Order was good at its first institution; since we read in Dist. 63, cap. Verum, that if our predecessors effected anything which, though good in their day, lapsed into error and superstition, as is patent in the case of the said Order, it should be destroyed by posterity without delay . . . again I say without delay, lest this obstinate spark of error become a flame to fire the whole earth, and then there happens what Jerome spoke of, saying: 'Arius was only a spark in Alexandria, but not being extinguished, his flame scorched the entire world.'" Such is the interpretation of the qualifying clause in the Clementine decree given by two authors quoted by Alexandre; namely, Walsingham,¹ and the Continuator of Nange.² The former says that when the members of the Council debated whether "the entire Order could be condemned because of the citations of particular guilty members, as it was evident that the said Order had not been cited, the said Council decided (it should be done) not *de jure*; therefore Pope Clement inserted this clause." The Continuator of Nange says that the Pontiff "condemned the Order of Templars, not by means of a definitive sentence, because the Order had not been convicted as an Order; but merely by way of provision and ordinance. However, because the manner of reception, which hitherto they had refused to divulge, was suspected of old, and had now been revealed by many principal men of the Order, the Apostolic authority, with the approval of the Sacred Council, both wiped out the name of the Order, and abolished its habit; for the Order was now useless, since no good man would wish to enter it, and other evils were to be removed and scandals to be avoided."

It is asserted by certain apologists of the Templars³ that Pope Clement V. abolished the Order by his own authority, in a secret Consistory. When this objection is made by a Catholic, it may be met with the reply that the sole authority of the Pontiff was sufficient in the premises. But the assertion is untrue. The decree of suppression was drawn up on March 22, 1312, but it was published on April 3d, in full Council, the Pope declaring that it was

¹ *English History*, y. 1311.

² Y. 1310.

³ Thus Voltaire in his *Essay on Universal History*; and C. G. Addison, in his *Knights of the Temple*, London, 1841. See Palma, *loc. cit.*

issued *with the approbation of the Holy Council*. Against this declaration of the Pontiff a certain writer¹ alleges that the fathers, with only four exceptions, evinced a repugnance to the decree. It is impossible to avoid accusing this writer of bad faith in this matter. He appeals to the "Annals" of Raynald (y. 1311, No. 55), but if the reader will examine for himself, he will find that in the cited passage the annalist simply narrates how the fathers were divided as to the *manner* of condemnation, and how a bishop (supposed to be Durand, cited above) insisted on an immediate abolition, whether it were to be effected, as some wished, *de rigore juris*, or as others preferred, "by way of Apostolic provision." There is no mention or insinuation that the prelates disagreed with Pope Clement as to the necessity of suppressing the Templars.

Coming now to the arguments adduced by the apologists of the Templars, we first notice the one based on the authority of Villani, St. Antonine of Florence, Dante, Boccaccio, Trithemius, and Paul Emilius. Of what value is the authority of Villani in the subject-matter? His diction is certainly Tuscan in its purity, and he is a lucid and ingenious chronicler when unfettered by prejudice; but his writings are not always to be taken as gospel truth. Muratori, than whom no better judge in such matters can be desired, says that "this historian gives us not a few fables when he describes remote events,"² and that, in regard to the time of Frederick II., and the following period, "he is not always to be believed."³ And we, know that Villani could never forgive the blunder of Clement V., whereby the Italians had to lament the seventy years of the "Babylonian captivity." As for St. Antonine, we must respect his sanctity, admire his canonical and moral science, but as a historian we must place him in the same category with John of Salisbury—among those who feed upon popular rumors, but who cannot digest such deceptive morsels. Like Villani, Dante, Boccaccio, and most Italians of that day, he naturally regarded the papal residence at Avignon with a religious and patriotic aversion, and was ready to credit Clement V., the cause of the "captivity," with many foolish and wicked actions. Thus, he records the popular notion that this pontiff was guilty of lust, simony, and necromancy, although the most reliable records of his time show Clement to have been an upright, though, perhaps, too compliant a pastor. And it may be reckoned that St. Antonine, when treating of the events of Clement's reign, is a mere transcriber of Villani; two-thirds of his sentences are literal translations from this author's Italian work. Seldom, indeed, does he seem inclined to venture

¹ Addison.

² In Preface to his edition of Villani's *History*.

³ *Writers on Italian Affairs*, vol. xiii., pt. 3.

an opinion which he is ready to defend as his own. Nearly every passage is introduced by a "they say," or, "it is believed," or, "many dignitaries assert." Therefore, since he must be regarded in the same light with Villani, we decline his authority in this matter of the Templars, especially because he is directly refuted, as we shall soon prove, by contemporary or quasi-contemporary authors of undoubted reliability.

Dante can be of little avail in defence of the knights; for, although he condemns Clement V. to hell,¹ it is because of that pontiff's reputed simony that the poet so writes, rather than on account of the abolition of the Order. We may here observe, that when Dante's politics required such obliviousness, he quite forgot his enmity to "the Gascon," as he often styled Clement in his letters; transcendent as was his genius, he was very human in his policy. Thus, when he heard that Henry of Luxembourg, just elected "king of the Romans," was about to descend into Italy, he wrote, in 1310, a letter "to the kings Robert of Naples, and Frederick of Sicily; to the senators of Rome; to the dukes, marquises, counts, and all the peoples of Italy,"² in the interest of unity and peace; in which letter, since hitherto Pope Clement had been favorable to Henry, the poet forgot his trick in the "Comedy," and tried to unite Guelphs and Ghibellines in honoring that pontiff. Encouraging his countrymen to obey Henry, Dante exclaims: "Open the eyes of your minds, and see how the Lord of heaven and earth has given us a monarch. This king is the one whom Peter, the vicar of God, commands us to honor; he is the one whom Clement, the successor of Peter, illumines with the light of the Apostolic benediction." And, in a letter to Henry, he thus vituperates rebel Florence: "With the cruelty of a viper she tries to wound the bosom of her mother, when she directs the horn of rebellion against Rome, who made her in her own image and likeness. With perverse obstinacy she tries to nullify the consent given in your favor by the Roman Pontiff, who is the father of fathers."³

Boccaccio is represented as favoring the innocence of the Templars, but he also merely echoes popular Italian rumor, naturally ready to second any report hostile to the pontiff who had transferred the papal residence to France.

¹ *Hell*, canto 19

² This letter of Dante's was known of old only by means of an anonymous translation into Italian, supposed to be by Marsilio Ficino. But in 1843, Torri published the Latin original from a Vatican MS.

³ An Italian translation of this letter was first published by Doni in 1547; but it being suspected as not very faithful, the original Latin text was greatly desired by the learned and the curious. It was finally discovered by Moschini, prefect of the Marcian Library, in Venice, in 1827.

Trithemius is also presented as an apologist for the Templars, since he tells us that Clement V. condemned them, "at the instigation of king Philip, by whose favor he had been made Pope; the Templars were very wealthy, and that he might obtain their possessions, the king, falsely, as many think, charged them with heresy." But this author shows himself unworthy of credence in anything concerning the Fifteenth Council, for he asserts that it lasted two years, whereas it is certain that it lasted only seven months. Again, he, like St. Antonine, hesitates as to his position, for he inserts the qualifying clause, "as many think." Paul Emilius is also adduced to defend the knights. He asserts that the movable goods of the Templars were kept by Philip, and only the immovable handed over to the Hospitalers; but that this is untrue will be shown when we come to the defence of the king in this matter. Papire Masson is also quoted by the friends of the knights, but as he simply relies upon Villani, we reject his authority in the premises.

To the above authors, quoted by the Templarites in order that they may prove that the vile passions of Philip the Fair found ready instruments in a Roman pontiff and his court, and in nearly all the bishops, inquisitors, kings, and magistrates of his time, we now oppose some contemporary authorities of greater weight than any adduced against our position. The testimony of the Continuator of Nange has been already given. Bernard Guido, a Dominican, and for eighteen years an inquisitor at Toulouse, died in 1331, leaving a reputation for great learning and sanctity. Among many valuable works, he wrote a "Chronicle," reaching to 1330, which he dedicated to Pope John XXII. Speaking of the year 1307, he says: "On the feast of St. Edward the Confessor, the 3d of the ides of October, by order of the king and Council, all the Templars in France were arrested; everybody wondered that this ancient Order of knights, so greatly privileged by the Roman Church, should be thus treated, for, excepting a few sworn secretaries, all were ignorant of the reason. However, the cause was finally manifested and given to public execration; namely, their profane rite of profession celebrated with a denial of Christ, and by a spitting upon the crucifix in contempt of the Crucified. Many of them, even dignitaries of the Order, acknowledged this abominable, execrable, and unmentionable ceremony of initiation, of which hitherto all (outsiders) had been ignorant. Some of them, however, though subjected to question and torture, would not confess. Finally, the Roman See, *which at first had regarded the accusation as incredible, and had been greatly displeased at the arrest,*¹ became

¹ Here Bernard directly contradicts the assertion of St. Antonine that Clement V. had "conceded by Letters Apostolic that all the Templars, throughout the world,

better informed at Poitiers, where the curia was residing; for, several of the Templars, being brought before the Pope and some cardinals, there avowed that the previous confessions were true; and therefore, it was then ordered, that the Templars should be arrested everywhere, and the truth be brought to light." The testimony given in the Fifteenth Council, by the "bishop renowned for learning and sanctity," supposed to have been Durand of Mende, may also be examined. Albertino Mussato (d. 1329) has the following: "About seventy-two of the masters, preceptors, and soldiers of the house of the knights of the Temple of Jerusalem having been convicted, and having confessed, awaited the Apostolic censures; and, O shame! although we ought not to relate such infamous things, yet, they are to be spoken of for the punishment of the transgressors, and that posterity may be more cautious in avoiding what our age has experienced; these abominable beasts, endowed with human forms, these brothers—or rather enemies—armed with the sign of the cross, long ago devoted their souls to Satan in their reception into the Order, by a denial of Christ, by a spitting on the cross, and by other things not to be mentioned for the sake of human shame." Mussato, well remarks Alexandre, was an Italian, and therefore not likely to be sympathetic with the court of Avignon; therefore, his testimony is of double weight. Walsingham, whose "English History" is one of the best sources of information for the historian, tells us in his "Life of Edward II.," that "the Templars were accused and convicted of this, that when they received any one into the Order, all but the brethren having been removed, they led the candidate to a private place, *et totaliter denudaverunt et tunc unus accederet ad eundem, et eum oscularetur in posteriori parte*. . . . Then, a cross was brought forward, and he was told that Christ was not crucified, but a certain false prophet, who was condemned by the Jews to death for his crimes. Then, the candidate was made to spit thrice upon the cross, and it was thrown to the ground, and they made him trample upon it with his feet. After this, they showed him the head of a certain idol, which they daily adored. Besides these things, it was deposed against them, that they were polluted with the vice of sodomy. . . . Hence, when a Provincial Council was called at London, to consider these accusations, the accused Templars acknowledged the rumor, but not the fact, unless on the part of a few. Nevertheless, all finally admitted that they could not clear themselves

should be arrested on the same day." We may, also, passingly remark, that these arrests did not take place on the same day. Those in the French dominions occurred on October 13, 1307; those in England, on January 10, 1308; those in Aragon, in November, 1307.

of the accusations, and hence the Council condemned them to perpetual penance." When Walsingham says that the Templars admitted "the rumor, but not the fact," he evidently alludes only to the English knights, for at the moment he is talking of the Provincial Council, convened in 1309 by the English primate, Robert of Winchelsea, and when he speaks of the Templars in general, he says that the charges were proved.¹ To these testimonies, of authors contemporary, or nearly so, with the abolition of the Templars, we may add that of a more modern writer, one who is frequently quoted by the apologists of the Order, namely, the famous Jesuit historian, Mariana. After enumerating the charges against the knights, this author asks: "What will the reader now say? Will he regard these accusations as founded in fact, or rather as fictions, and not unlike the tales of silly old women? Certainly, Villani, Antonine, and others, reject them as calumnies; but the more general report, and a nearly universal consent, condemns the Templars. . . . That the Order so soon degenerated into every kind of wickedness, would scarcely be credible, unless the Diplomas of Clement, from which we have drawn these things, and which are extant among the archives of the great church of Toledo, were proof that the reports were not unfounded; for he affirms that sixty-two (seventy-two) of the Order when questioned before himself, admitted the mentioned crimes and sought pardon."

The partisans of the Templars insist upon the comparative innocence of the English knights, and tell us that "in Spain they were honorably and enthusiastically acquitted. In Germany also they were acquitted."² That the English Templars showed a far better record than their continental brethren is true; and "if it be fair," says Lingard, "to judge from the informations taken in England,

¹ "*Depositum fuit contra Templarios et compertum*"—in his essay on the *Accusations against the Templars*, the Protestant Nicolai explains the contradictions of the witnesses, in reference to the initiations, by the fact that there were various kinds of receptions, and that all the knights did not receive the same secrets. Many of the depositions show this to have been the case.

² *Catholic Dictionary*, by Addis and Arnold. In this work we are told that "whatever confessions individual Templars made, were extorted by torture . . . and were invariably retracted when the victims found themselves out of the king's power. The Pope, Clement V., interfered so far as he dared, but too weakly and irresolutely to save them. . . . The Order was dissolved in France, and all its wealth seized by the king." The assertions as to torture and Philip's avarice are noticed by us in the text. The remark on Pope Clement's conduct is unjust to that Pontiff. So soon as he heard of the king's initiative, he reserved the cause of the knights to himself, and took their property under the protection of the Church. He "dared to interfere" just so long as justice demanded his intervention. He secured to the accused a fair trial before himself, in one case, and before his deputies, in all the others. To have gone further than this, to have shielded the impenitent, and to have continued the Papal sanction to so foully stained an institute, would have been worse than weak and irresolute.

however, we may condemn a few individuals, we must certainly acquit the Order."¹ But it would not be fair to so judge; nor was Pope Clement V. guilty of any such unfairness. He did not form his decision from an inspection of isolated cases, nor should we so form one. Again, we must remember that the English Templars had three years in which to defend themselves, for so long did their trial last; that Archbishop Robert of Winchelsea, who presided, was one of the most inflexible and independent prelates who ever sat in the chair of Canterbury, and that neither he nor his suffragans had anything to expect or fear from Philip; and yet, after mature deliberation, the English knights were condemned. We may well refuse, therefore, to believe, even with regard to this portion of the Order, that it was condemned "upon evidence so flimsy that in the present day a man could not be convicted on it of the most trifling offence."² As for the acquittal of the knights in the Synods of Salamanca and Metz, the innocence of some of the Templars does not acquit the entire Order, as was well understood by Mariana: "In the cause of the Templars it was decreed that their name and Order should be entirely abolished. To many this decree seemed cruel, nor is it probable that those crimes were found in every province, contaminating all the members. However, by the destruction of this Order, a warning to avoid similar iniquities was given to all, especially to religious, whose value and strength consist more in a reputation for virtue than in anything else."³ It must be observed, however, that according to the same Mariana, the prelates assembled at Salamanca gave no final and positive decision of acquittal in regard to the Spanish knights, but "referred the ultimate settlement of the whole affair to the Roman Pontiff." The apologists of the Templars do not gain sympathy for their clients by adducing the action of the Synod of Metz. The German bishops there assembled to consider, by order of Clement V., the case of the Templars, did not acquit the knights; but referred the matter to the Holy See. And even that leniency was procured by violence; for Serarius and Mariana tell us that Hugh, count of the Rhine, and twenty armed Templars burst into the Synod, "terrifying the fathers by their ferocity;" whereupon, lest a tumult might arise, the archbishop received their protest, and promised to use his influence with the Pontiff to secure their not being disturbed."⁴

Voltaire insists that King Philip, in his anxiety for vengeance on the Templars, many of whom had been outspoken against his oppressions, and in his covetousness of their great wealth, prepared

¹ *History of England*, vol. iii., ch. 1.

³ B. xv., ch. 10.

² *Catholic Dictionary*.

⁴ B. viii., ch. 92.

in advance the mine which, in his own good time, he exploded. Villani tells us that the grand master had condemned the prior of the Templars of Montfaucon to perpetual imprisonment because of immorality and heresy; that during his confinement the prior became acquainted with one Nasso, a Florentine, also a prisoner; that this pair, with a view to obtaining their release, invented the famous charges against the Order. Such, says Voltaire, was the origin of Philip's scheme. But while this narration of Villani may be true, and Mariana receives it as such, nevertheless, the evidence of the worthy pair was not uncorroborated. "The first witnesses," says Mariana, "were two members of the Order, the prior of Montfaucon in the county of Toulouse, and Nasso, a Florentine exile—not sufficiently reliable, as was shown by the testimony of many. Then came others, among whom was a chamberlain of the Pontiff himself, who had joined the Order in his eleventh year, and who related what he had seen and done."¹ But the favorite argument of Voltaire and the other apologists is derived from the tortures which, they say, extorted the confessions of the Templars. James Molay, the grand master, and others who were burnt at Paris, retracted these extorted avowals, and died protesting their innocence, and that of their Order. Even the Continuator of Nange, an author whom we often quote in favor of our thesis, gives the following melancholy picture. When treating of the year 1310 he says: "Outside the city of Paris, in the fields not far from the abbey of St. Anthony, fifty-nine Templars were burnt to death. All of these, with no exception, acknowledged none of the imputed crimes, but constantly and perseveringly declared that they were unjustly put to death." And at the year 1313 he writes: "When the aforesaid four, the general or transmarine master of the Order of the Temple, the visitor for France; and the masters of Aquitaine and Normandy, the final disposition of whose cases the Pope had reserved to himself, had, without exception, publicly and openly confessed the imputed crimes, and had persisted in that confession, and had appeared to wish to finally persist in it, a council was held with great deliberation on the Monday after the feast of St. Gregory, in the vestibule of the great church at Paris, by mandate of the Pope, and the aforesaid four were adjudged to perpetual imprisonment by the lord-cardinal of Albano and two other cardinal-legates the archbishop of Sens, certain other prelates, and other persons versed in Divine and Canon law, specially summoned to Paris for this case. But behold, when the cardinals had thought an end had been put to the business, two of the aforesaid, namely, the transmarine master and the master of Normandy, suddenly and un-

¹ B. xv., ch. 15.

expectedly defending themselves against the cardinal who had delivered a sermon, and against the archbishop of Sens, returned to a denial of their confession, and of all that they had acknowledged, most irreverently and to the wonder of many. Then the cardinals handed them over to the provost of Paris, who was present, to be merely guarded until the morrow, when their case would be more carefully considered. So soon as the news of what had occurred reached the king, who was then in the royal palace, having counselled with his courtiers, but wisely (*prudente consilio*) calling no clergyman to the conference, he commanded that both should be burnt at the same stake, on a little island of the Seine between the royal gardens and the church of the Hermits. They appeared to undergo the burning willingly and readily, and their final constancy in death excited the wonder of all the beholders. The two others were confined in the prison to which they had been sentenced." Now Voltaire asserts that the confessions of the Templars were drawn from them by torture. While, on the one hand, we would not attempt to defend the use of "the question" in a law court, neither would we, on the other, assert with Voltaire that every confession so obtained is valueless. But granting the worthlessness of every evidence so evolved, is it true that the testimony because of which the Templars were abolished was extracted by torture from unwilling lips? We do not deny that the torture was applied in some instances, but certainly there was no such thing in the case of the hundred and twenty-four knights examined before the inquisitor at Paris, or in that of the seventy-two interrogated by the Pontiff at Poitiers; and yet these knights, and others similarly situated, admitted their guilt.¹ This is shown by the *Acts* of the trial, by the diploma "Reigning in Heaven" already cited, and by the other diploma given by Raynald at the year 1307,

¹ Speaking of the prosecution of the Templars of Lombardy and Tuscany, conducted by the archbishops of Pisa and Florence and by a Roman canon, Cantu's love of truth forces him to say: "Here the accused had no fear, as they would have had in France, of being sent to the stake; for they were being tried by an ecclesiastical tribunal which assigned as punishment only repentance and retraction. This adds to the reliability of the deposition which they swore to have made, 'not out of hatred, or out of love; not for reward or because of fear; but merely for the sake of truth.' Some of the accusations were admitted by all; some others only by certain knights, and as regarding particular cases and persons, or as being matters of hearsay, or as being customary beyond the sea. But, above all, they agreed in admitting the most jealous secrecy of the chapters, and the guilt of infidel blasphemy. *If, therefore, the wicked prosecutions instituted in France tempt us to regard the Templars as innocent, and as victims of Philip the Fair, the calm with which the Church proceeded, the processes instituted during many years in Italy and in other lands, and without violence, allow us to suppose that many of the knights were guilty, and that the king of France should not be compared with Clement V., who, by suppressing the Order, 'not de jure, but by way of provision,' saved innocent individuals, and disappointed the royal greed by assigning its wealth to the defence of the Holy Land.*"—*Heretics of Italy*, Discourse viii.

No. 12. As for the fact that the grand master and other Templars died asserting their innocence; that the former and the master of Normandy retracted their former confessions; such facts by no means prove that the Order was unjustly suppressed. Criminals very frequently die with lies on their lips; and that James Molay lied most solemnly, either at the stake or in his repeated and spontaneous confessions, is indisputably proven. We are not bound to explain his vacillations. It is well to know, however, that in the inquiry held at Chinon in Touraine on August 18-20, 1308, by three cardinals deputed by the Pope, the grand master was so astounded on hearing the many depositions which had been made at Paris and at Poitiers, that he kept silence on all the points saving that of the denial of Christ, which he expressly admitted to have been practiced. When interrogated at Paris on December 26, 1309, he disavowed this confession, and accused the commissioners of forgery; demanding afterward to be judged by the Pontiff. Whom ought we naturally suspect of falsehood, asks Bergier, the three cardinals or James Molay? The Pope had insisted on the observance of the strictest equity in the premises; the king had consulted the universities, the clergy, and the parliaments; nor did he need any forgeries, as we have seen, to attain his end, the extinction of the Order. We would therefore suspect the grand master of falsehood, rather than the cardinals. When finally the Fifteenth Council had been held, and the Templars had been suppressed, Clement V. appointed new commissioners to close the process, namely, three cardinals, the archbishop of Sens, several bishops, and many learned men. Before these, Molay, Guy of Auvergne, and two others again avowed their guilt, and on March 18, 1313, they were condemned to perpetual imprisonment. A platform, on which they were to affix their confessions, was erected in front of Notre Dame, but at the commencement of the ceremony, Molay and Guy suddenly retracted their avowals. For the grand catastrophe the Papal commissioners were not responsible. That was consummated in obedience to an order from king Philip, after they had delivered the culprits to the custody of the provost of Paris, intending to deliberate as to the sentence on the following day.

The grand master and the brother of the dauphin of Auvergne retracted their confessions, but we must remember that thirty or forty thousand other knights, who had been condemned to different kinds of punishment, survived the "persecuting" Philip and Clement, and did not retract or attempt to justify the Order. Again, even Michelet admits that "in the interrogatories which we publish, the denials are nearly all identical, as though according to a settled formula; while on the contrary, the avowals are all varied by special circumstances, often very naive, which facts give them

a peculiar stamp of veracity. Contrary, indeed, would have been the case, if the avowals had been extorted by torture; then they would have been nearly alike, and the diversity would have been found in the denials."¹

In his zealous championship of the Templars, the prince of modern incredulists asserts that "seventy-four of them, who had not been accused, undertook to defend the Order, but were not heard." Bergier's reply to this absolute falsehood is worthy of the reader's attention: "In other places the apologist cites the 'History of the Templars,' by Peter Dupuy. Now this historian relates that these seventy-four defenders of their Order were heard by the commissioners for the first time, on Saturday, March 14, 1310, and that they deputed four of their number to speak in the name of all. Not only were they heard, but they presented requests and memorials in writing. The verbal reports of their speeches were exactly drawn up, and the author of the 'History of the Gallican Church' has copied them. They protested against the confessions made by the accused; like the apologist, they declared that these admissions had been extorted by threats and promises, or that those who made them were wicked persons; they demanded to be judged by the Pope, and by the Council of Vienne, then about to assemble. Now what follows from this defence? Simply that those seventy-four Templars were innocent, for they were not accused; that until then they had been ignorant of the crimes of their brethren, and that they found it difficult to credit them. But this is only a negative proof; ignorance proves nothing; they adduced nothing positive capable of destroying the confession of the accused." Voltaire endeavors to evade the charges of obscenity among the knights by pleading that "this infamy never could have become a law among them. I do not doubt at all that many of the Templars yielded to those excesses which have been, at all times, the inheritance of youth; but these are passing vices, which it were better to ignore than to punish." To this characteristic remark we again reply with Bergier: "Here the author confounds two methods of reception. It is to be presumed that the public reception, performed by the grand master or others, was decent; but there was another, a private one, invented by the libertines of the Order, to which the new knights were subjected, and in which

¹ The name of Michelet is dear to all well-informed Masons, and should be cherished by all the Templarites. In the *Collection of Unedited Documents Concerning the History of France*, published by care of the Minister of Public Instruction, this writer gave to the world the verbal process of the Templars. Speaking of the interrogatory undergone by Molay and two hundred and thirty-one knights before the Pontifical commissioners at Paris, he says: "This inquiry was conducted slowly, and with much care and kindness."

were committed those abominations and profanations already mentioned. Many witnesses declared that they had been forced into this latter rite by prison and torture. It is well known that wicked persons desire to have accomplices in their crimes. The majority of those who were executed were not young men; therefore their vices were not passing ones. It is but too true that aged libertines are more given to excessive lubricity than are young people." Voltaire pretends to find it difficult to believe that the Templars denied Jesus Christ, and asks what had they to gain by renouncing a religion which cherished them, and for which they had so gloriously combated? But many impious men, and among them Voltaire himself, blaspheme against the religion which has nourished them; and what they have to gain we do not know. As for the combats of the Templars in the cause of the faith, these had long been, at least for the French members, things of the past.

We now come to the assertion that the suppression of the Templars is to be ascribed to the covetousness of King Philip the Fair;¹ Mosheim, Potter, Voltaire, in fine, all the apologists of the proscribed Order, assign this as the prime cause of the abolition. St. Antonine says that "many dignitaries asserted that the knights were innocent, and condemned without just cause, in order that their property might be confiscated. They were afterward despoiled of their goods by the Pope, and their revenues applied to the House or Hospital of St. John. But as the property had already been seized by the king of France and by other princes, it had to be redeemed at a heavy price; whence these latter religious were rendered very poor. . . . It was ordered (in the Fifteenth Council) that all the goods of the Templars should be assigned to the Hospital of Jerusalem, and as they had already been seized by various lay lords, the Hospitalers were compelled to pay a large sum to the king and others who held the property." And we are told by Paul Emilius that Philip's treasury "retained possession of the movable property, while that affixed to the soil was given by a Pontifical decree to the Hospitalers of St. John." Even Walsingham inveighs against Philip in this matter, although he admits that the king did not gain his point. He says that "Philip, king of France, thought to make one of his sons king of Jerusalem, and to obtain for him all the revenues of the Templars. . . . But he did not attain his wish in regard to the property, for the Pope assigned it to the Hospitalers." Now the innocence of Philip in this matter is proved, firstly, by the Diploma "Reigning in Heaven" of Clement V. The Pontiff says to the king: "At length, how-

¹ The *Catholic Dictionary* says that Philip "coveting their wealth, laid a deep plot for their destruction . . . all its wealth was seized by the king"

ever, you who had heard of these same iniquities, and moved, not by avarice, for you do not intend to claim or appropriate the property of the Templars, but have taken your hands altogether away from it, freely and devoutly yielding it up, to be guarded and administered by our deputies." The same is proved, secondly, by the letter sent in March, 1311, by Philip to the Pontiff, requesting that the property of the Templars be assigned either to some new Military Order, or to some old one engaged in the cause of the Holy Land. It is shown, thirdly, by the instrument of transfer of the property in question to the Hospitalers. In this document, dated August 24, 1312, we read: "Since the aforesaid properties, inasmuch as they are in our kingdom, are under our special care and protection, and it is known that we fully possess in them, either mediately or immediately, the right of patronage; and having been induced by you, together with the prelates united in Council, to give this consent: We, therefore, whose interest it is, accept this disposition, ordinance, and transfer, and give to it our consent; perpetually reserving to ourselves, and to the prelates, barons, nobles, and others of our kingdom, all our and their rights such as hitherto obtained in the said properties." The same is evinced, fourthly, by the agreement entered into between Louis X, the son and heir of Philip the Fair, and Villaret, the grand master of the Hospitalers, on February 14, 1315, in which it was arranged that the knights of the Hospital should pay the king 260,000 livres, for which sum, expended by the monarch in the prosecution of the Templars, the ceded property had been pledged; not that, says the agreement, the Knights of Rhodes had not already been in the enjoyment of the Templar revenues, by virtue of the possession given them by authority of King Philip, but because there were many expenses to be liquidated, dating from the time when the Templars were arrested.

We would now observe in conclusion that much of the sympathy which has been manifested for the Templars is due to the connection supposed—whether rightly or not, is of little importance—to subsist between the unfortunate Order and Freemasonry. "We shall see," says Condorcet, "whether we ought not to number among secret societies this celebrated Order, against which Popes and kings so barbarously conspired."¹ In his valuable work on secret societies, Deschamps derives Masonry from four sources, Gnosticism, Manicheism, the Albigenes, and *the Templars*.² "The Masons," he says, "and all the philosophical revolutionists and

¹ *Historic Tableau of the Progress of the Human Mind*, epoch 7.

² *Secret Societies and Society, or the Philosophy of Contemporaneous History*, vol. i., b. 2, ch. i., § 5; Avignon, 1882.

Jacobins had a great interest in defending the Templars," and then he proceeds to show, from Masonic authorities, how these secretaries claim a descent from the proscribed Order. Among the authorities cited by this zealous and indefatigable writer, we select one which will prove of interest to the reader. On April 8, 1839, M. de Banville, an ex-officer of the Grand Orient of France, spoke as follows in a Lodge of the Knights of the Cross: "The Masonic Order is an emanation from that of the Temple, with the history and misfortunes of which you are acquainted, and reasonably it can have no other origin. Masonry was born in Scotland, and originally it was a prudent and ably arranged disguise conceived by some knights of that country in order to hide the continuation of their illustrious Order from the keen eyes of its powerful enemies. The heroic William de Moure, grand prior of England and Scotland, directed from his prison the knights of his language in the creation, organization and development of the Masonic rite, destined to shield, from the eyes of the profane, the proscribed and anathematized Order of the Temple. We may conceive how this local transformation, in the language of Scotland, of the Order of the Temple into that of Masonry, was enveloped in secrecy; how the unfortunate Templars, calumniated by vile renegades, cowardly betrayed by ignoble apostates who tracked them like wild beasts in nearly every land of Christendom, forced to hide their names and quality under pain of the most frightful persecution and of the most horrible torture, innocent victims of a king's avarice and a Pope's jealousy; succeeded in inventing, that they might recognize and aid each other *in all, for all, and everywhere*, in France, Germany, and Sweden, where Masonry soon penetrated, those sacred passwords, signs, and grips, which have come down to us from generation to generation. How can we otherwise explain, on the part of a vast philanthropic association, organized for the honorable purposes of giving to suffering humanity the consolations and alms of Christian charity, those severe commands to *say nothing, write nothing, signify nothing*, concerning the praiseworthy object of this secret society, under pain of incurring the certain effects of an atrocious vengeance, exposing the traitor to have his throat cut, his heart and entrails torn out, his body burnt and reduced to ashes, the ashes thrown to the winds, and his memory execrated by every Mason? All this would become a revolting absurdity, without the explanation, so simple and satisfying to reason, that the knights of the Temple had a powerful interest in hiding themselves under the mantle of Masonry, specially organized by themselves for that purpose. I therefore affirm that the Masonic Order was established in the fourteenth century by the knights of the Temple, in obedience to the grand prior of Scotland, and that this

beautiful institution emanated from that centre, and easily propagated itself in the European countries, then covered by our proscribed predecessors. I could easily adduce numerous proofs, drawn from a comparison of the rituals in use in the two Orders, and at first it would astonish one to notice the same system of reception, proceeding by way of physical and moral tests.”¹ This theory of the Templar origin of Freemasonry is well developed in the “Masonic Manual” or “Tiler” of Willaume, and in the “Philosophical and Interpretative Course” of explanations of the symbols and mysteries of Masonry, published by Ragon, founder of the celebrated Lodge of the Trinosophists—a work solemnly authorized on June 24, 1840, by the Grand Orient of France. In contradiction to the above theory may be adduced the opinion of Guyot, printer to the French “Templars,” who published in 1825 a “Manual of the Knights of the Temple,” in which he contended that the Masonic claim is false; that Molay named his successor; and that the Templars continued to have an uninterrupted succession of grand masters down to Fabré-Palaprat, elected in 1804. As Philip d’Orleans was grand master of these “Templars” in 1706, it is amusing to read that they sign with their blood the oaths of obedience, poverty, chastity (!), fraternity, hospitality, and military service; and that each “knight” is obliged, if he can possibly do so, to visit the Holy Land once in his life. Lenoix, in his “Origin of Freemasonry,” insists that St. Bernard, who gave their rule to the knights, was a Mason. If this assumption surprises the reader, he should know that Ragon, than whom there has never been a more authoritative writer on Masonic subjects, declares that the chevalier (*sic*) Gerson, or Thomas A’Kempis, the author of the “Imitation of Christ,” was also a Mason, and that his book, “the masterpiece of one deeply initiated, undoubtedly gave rise to the mystic veil with which, under the titles of ‘Rose-Cross,’ ‘Knight of the Eagle and of the Pelican,’ the last mysteries of Masonry are covered.”²

¹ *The Globe*, a journal of Masonic initiations, Paris, 1839.

² *Loc. cit.*

WHY EDUCATION SHOULD BE FREE.

THE wild utterances of many of the friends of the State schools would be amusing, if they were not mischievous. They horribly misrepresent the position of a certain class of our citizens. This class are denounced by them as enemies of constitutional government, as traitors to the country, because, as alleged, they are enemies of the State schools.

Were we to admit that they are enemies of the State schools, it would not follow that they are enemies of the Republic. There is nothing in the Constitution of the Republic that warrants the assertion. There is nothing in the law that will sustain it. There is no proposition more undeniable than that to the parent belongs the education of the child. It is his right, his duty, and, if he be true to his obligation, he cannot be interfered with. Because parents discharge this duty, conformably to their religious belief, are they, therefore, enemies of the State schools? That the discharge of a duty imposed by nature and commanded by divine and human law, can be so construed, is to assume that there is something wrong in the constitution of the State school. That there is something wrong, is beyond question; else why the complaints from other quarters outside of the particular class referred to? In so complaining, are they enemies of the State schools, or of the Republic? If a taxpayer complains of the management of one of our eleemosynary institutions, is he, therefore, an enemy to that institution? Clearly not. His desire is not to destroy but to purify. As a taxpayer it is his unquestionable right to protest against any abuse which he discovers. Now, the State school rests on the very same foundation that our eleemosynary institutions rest. It has no other legal status. When it goes beyond this it must do so at the expense of those who desire it. If, therefore, the majority desire a system of the proportions of the existing system, the class so freely; so shamefully and so cowardly abused have no objection to their having it. They simply say that as for themselves they will none of it, and let those who want it pay for it. This is a fair statement of the position of the extremists of this class.

Considering that it is the duty of the parent to educate his child—that to him alone belongs this education—that the law of nature, of God, and of the land, so regard it—what is there objectionable even in this view of the matter? All the talk about the necessity of the State school, all the arguments

advanced to support it are, in presence of the facts that confront us, the sheerest nonsense. That the system has not given satisfaction to the parties concerned, is a fact. That it cannot do so, is beyond question. When it suits the Catholic it will displease the Protestant. When the Protestant is enamoured with it, the Catholic, for very good reasons, dislikes it. When the Agnostic eulogizes it, the Catholic and Protestant alike denounce it. When Catholic and Protestant are satisfied, the Agnostic and Jew are in a rage. The Protestant says, I must have the Bible. The Catholic says, I must have the catechism. The Agnostic says, away with your Bible and catechism. If you want them read them at home or in the churches; the State school is no place for the Bible, the catechism, or God. The Jew—poor fellow—hardly knows what to say, and feels the less he says the better for him. The Agnostic has the *law*, and while the Protestant has not the Bible, he thinks, whether he be liberal or bigoted, that he can manage with what he gets. Such a Protestant is in the early stages of Agnosticism, and may be classed as an Agnostic.

From a system thus constituted, the Catholic, the Jew and the rigid Protestant are excluded. Thus excluded, is there any reason or any law for imposing a tax on them to give almost a collegiate education to the children of those who are in easy or affluent circumstances? We think not. The province of government is to feed, clothe, educate and take care of those who cannot or will not take care of themselves. Further than this it cannot bind all, without the consent of all. To this extent taxation is allowable, and that it is so allowable we are entirely indebted to the Christianity which is rejected by our schools as an element of discord. If, therefore, any one is dissatisfied with the State schools and cannot conscientiously patronize them, regard should be paid to his conscientious objections.

Now, it must be conceded that no uniform system can be devised that will suit all. If no uniform system can be devised that will suit all, and if the parental right cannot be assumed by the government without the parents' consent or negligence, it follows that any impediment on the part of the government to the exercise of the parental right is unjust and illegal. The plea of the public welfare will not justify the infringement of a right and a duty—a right springing from nature—a duty enjoined by human and divine law. But a tax to sustain the system of State schools as at present constituted and operated, is such an infringement. Therefore it is unjust and illegal.

Should parents, therefore, refuse to pay a tax or murmur at its imposition, is there any reason for branding them as enemies of

the Republic? There is none. Let the Agnostic or his liberal or bigoted Protestant friend indulge in educational luxuries to their hearts' content, the Catholic, the Jew and the rigid Protestants only say let them pay for them. This is justice, this is law, this is common sense, this is *American*. If the Republic cannot be maintained on this basis, it is not worth maintaining. An infidel Republic is an impossibility, and even were it possible it would be undesirable.

"Do not," says Balmes, in his great work on Civilization, "forget this, you who make war upon religion in the name of liberty; do not forget that like causes produce like effects. Where moral influences do not exist, their absence must be supplied by physical force: if you take from the people the sweet yoke of religion, you leave governments no other resource than the vigilance of police, and the force of bayonets."

A republic based upon the absorption of the individual by the body politic would, if possible, be still worse. All the demagogic or ignorant utterances about the homogeneity of the American people, are disgusting and defamatory. They are founded on the infamous assumption that the great bulk of the people, seeking homes here, are ignorant and degraded. Is the resolute, brave, independent German—the man who feels that he can be the architect of his own fortune—who knows that he has the brawn and brain to cleave a way for himself in a strange land far from the home of his earlier days—who is intelligent and moral—to be told that he is so degraded, and so devoid of common sense, that he cannot be trusted with the freedom for which he has so long pined and for which he sunders the dearest associations that cluster around the heart? Such a declaration is brutal. It is a brutal insult not alone to the German, but also to the Swede, the Norwegian, the Englishman, and the Irishman who come here to make homes for themselves, their little ones and their relatives. Men of this character—and they form the great bulk of our emigrant class—have the sense to accommodate themselves to their surroundings, and know that their true interests are identical with those of the law-abiding citizens of the Republic.

Are their customs criminal? Have not their lives been regulated by the precepts of the gospel? Must they be put in a straight jacket of Puritan design in order to be good American citizens? The Republic requires nothing of the kind, and to no other power do they owe allegiance. With the peculiar ideas of others, with their rights as individuals and families, they have nothing to do; and in reference to their own ideas, to their rights as individuals and families, they say, hands off. "We will not submit to your dictation, or to your assumption of superiority. We have rights with which you cannot interfere. They are absolute rights. They

are beyond your control. Among these rights, is the right to control the education of our children according to the dictates of our consciences; and this right, founded in nature and sanctioned by law, we will not yield. Our rights as citizens and individuals are equal to yours, notwithstanding that your ancestors may have driven the Indian from his home and appropriated his property. The parents who nurtured us and the teachers who instructed us, were as good, affectionate and wise as were yours. And if you force us to tell you the plain truth, and you yourselves must know it, we tell you to your teeth that this Republic was mainly established by the blood and treasure of foreigners. Washington is authority for the declaration that to Ireland and France—both Catholic countries—the Republic owes its existence. We tell you further, that in every dark hour of the Republic's life, foreigners were arrayed under its glorious banner in the proportion of two to one, according to their numbers.

"You want unity. You would by means of a common education form individuals and families into ONE compact whole. The Republic wants no such barbaric principle. It is her boast that she does not interfere with the manners of people, and that she fosters individual liberty to the fullest extent compatible with her safety. This boast is heard in every civilized land. Away up in the mountains of Switzerland the daring hunter hears it, and his eyes and soul follow the setting sun. The dweller along the castled Rhine hears it, and his mind is with his heart, and both are far away, where the western waves lave the shores of freedom. On Galtee slopes and Carpathian heights it is heard, and the fire of liberty, which centuries of oppression could not quench, blazes, as it blazed in the grand old days of Brian and Sobieski.

"Is this boast an *ignis fatuus*, a mirage? No, it is a living reality, and the bigots and cranks who stand in the way of its full realization, must yield or be trampled on. *We will pay willingly for no systems to mould us in their image and likeness.* Our manners and customs are our own. We will speak the language of our ancestors and teach it to our little ones whose education we will not commit to the fluctuating will of majorities. We will not be the dupes of ignorant or degraded preachers, mercenary scribblers and ruffian politicians, who, while they talk loudly of the glories of American institutions, are a disgrace to human nature. With intelligence to know what the Republic demands of us, and a will to comply with those demands, we can bid defiance to the venal and corrupt who live by defamation. The liberty secured to us as individuals we will use wisely and defend bravely."

This is the language the naturalized citizen holds and justly holds. He c'aims, and will exercise, individual liberty. He considers in-

dividual liberty an essential element of republican government, and the unity, which the absorption of the individual by the body politic is designed to effect, he regards as opposed to free government and Christian civilization. He therefore rejects this unity and the means that lead to it. Is he right in his rejection? Does history sustain him?

Guizot the eminent publicist in his magnificent lectures on European civilization says: "Where you find in ancient civilization liberty, it is political liberty, the liberty of the citizen. It is not with his personal liberty that the man is prepossessed, it is with his liberty as a citizen; he belongs to an association, he is ready to sacrifice himself for an association." Again: "Whenever we contemplate the civilizations of the ancients, we find them all impressed with one ever-prevailing character of unity, visible in their institutions, their ideas, and manners; one sole, or at least one very preponderating influence, seems to govern and determine all things."

If we consult the history of the various nations of the Orient and of Europe, previous to the introduction of Christianity, we will find evidence the most convincing of the truth of these observations. What a shocking spectacle meets our gaze when we rivet it, for a moment, on the Oriental nations! The king or ruler, a divinity; all under him, slaves or menials. Arrogating to himself the prerogatives of God, while indulging the crafty and loathsome passions of man, the power of the ruler was without bounds or limits. Life, property and liberty were at his feet, and subject to his capricious will. Law had no existence independent of him. With far more truth could he exclaim, "I am the State," than did the glorious, though despotic, French monarch ages later.

Whatever the form of the government, whether theocratic, aristocratic or democratic, the rulers and ruled had these characteristics. Oriental society was, therefore, a sort of unity to which all must be sacrificed. "It belonged," to use the language of Guizot, "to one exclusive power which could bear with no other. Every principle of a different tendency was proscribed. The governing principle would nowhere suffer by its side the manifestation and influence of a rival principle."

Passing from Asia to Europe we stand in the presence of Greece, the most eulogized of nations. The poet and the orator, the sculptor and the painter have paid to it the homage of their genius. Travellers from every civilized land have been eager to catch a glimpse of it, even in ruins. It has been the inspiration of a literature almost as grand as that which, ages ago, sprang up in its own soil. It is the Mecca of the student and the patriot; it is the Paradise of the sentimentalist.

That genius should be aroused to its loftiest flights, that enthusiasm verging on adoration should burst forth as all that is bright and glorious in its history passes before the mind, is, indeed, but natural. On that mental picture we will cast no shadow. Standing alone, no praise can be too extravagant for it, and we but heighten admiration when we say that it is a picture painted for us by a people who knew no liberty but political liberty, the liberty of the citizen. Liberty, as we understand it, had no lasting home in any of its states. It certainly did not exist in Sparta or Lacedæmon under the iron laws of Lycurgus. At intervals Athens caught glimpses of it, and these glimpses were productive of such marvellous results, as almost to justify the gorgeous rhetorical display with which Lord Macaulay concludes his review of Mitford.

As the liberty enjoyed by the Athenians bears a close resemblance to the liberty for which many are contending to-day in this Republic, we will quote a few sentences descriptive of it from this brilliant essayist; they are to the point. The advocates of unity and its methods will find them interesting, if not confounding.

"At Athens the laws did not constantly interfere with the tastes of the people. The children were not taken from their parents by that universal step-mother, the State. They were not starved into thieves, nor tortured into bullies; there was no established table at which every one must dine, no established style in which every one must converse. An Athenian might eat whatever he could afford to buy, and talk as long as he could find people to listen. The government did not tell the people what opinions they were to hold, or what songs they were to sing. Freedom produced excellence. Thus philosophy took its origin. Thus were produced those models of poetry, of oratory and of the arts which scarcely fall short of the standard of ideal excellence. Nothing is more conducive to happiness than the free exercise of the mind in pursuits congenial to it. This happiness, assuredly, was enjoyed far more at Athens than at Sparta."

In the days of Pericles, when the freedom here described by Lord Macaulay was at its zenith, Athens presented a spectacle that dazzled, and still continues to dazzle, the world. Such a spectacle would be impossible under the tameness, the unity and the slavery of Sparta and Lacedæmon.

Pericles is gathered to his fathers, the freedom that blazed like a meteor has disappeared, and twenty-eight years after, Socrates drinks the hemlock. War has degraded the Athenian, and stripped him of the pleasure of feeling himself a man, the feeling of personality, of human spontaneity in its free development, with which Pericles had invested him, and which produced such grand results. The star of Sparta is in the ascendant. The banner of

brute force, of individual slavery, is triumphant. The struggle against nature and reason has begun. The edifice of Pericles must be torn down, and that of Lycurgus reared on its ruins. Athenian genius, Athenian manhood, must be cramped, fettered, put into a mould. *The welfare of the State requires it.* Plato, the pupil of Socrates, Plato the divine, shutting his eyes to the light which illumined his earlier years, and to which he is indebted for the development of his God-like intellect, asks: "Is not the worst evil of a State that which divides it, and *makes many out of one?* And is not the greatest excellence of a State that which binds all its parts together, and makes it *one?*" This great man, transformed by war and power and luxury, would take individuals and families and form them into *one* compact whole. To this end, what does he propose? To have education in common and women and children in common. Individual liberty must be crushed that the State may live. The State will have no rival; it will admit of no check. Individuals must live, think, feel and act only as parts of a great whole.

The teaching of Aristotle, who wielded the sceptre of philosophy after the death of Plato, was not more elevated or rational. Aristotle, however, was less culpable than his master. Plato was a native of Athens; he should have had the spirit and the manhood that made her name immortal. Aristotle had no tie binding him to her, except that of philosophy. He was a stranger in a strange land, and his views, if faulty, had the authority of one whose soul should be attuned to her capacities and aspirations. It is no matter of surprise, therefore, to hear him complain of the freedom of education that prevailed in his day, and sigh for the slavery of Sparta. Why does he complain of this freedom, and sigh for a system repugnant alike to nature and reason? Let him speak for himself: "As the object of society is *one*, it is clear that the education of all its members ought necessarily to be one and identical. Education ought to be public and not private; as things now are, each one takes care of his children as he thinks proper, and teaches them as he pleases. Each citizen is a particle of society, and the care to be given to a particle ought naturally extend to what the whole requires."¹

Doctrines such as these hastened the fall of Athens—Athens, for which Cimon and Pericles had done so much. When the Macedonian came, the spirit that nerved the arm of the Athenian to strike down and hurl from the soil of Greece the Persian invader, the spirit that evoked the creations of Phidias, aroused and sustained the genius of Thucydides, was dead.

¹ *Polit.*, i., viii., c. i.

“—Self-abasement paved the way,
To villain bonds and despot's sway.”

Vain the valor of Phocion and the eloquence of Demosthenes; the light of other days was extinguished and could not be re-lit. Philip triumphed, and Athens fell to rise no more.

Now, as the doctrine taught by these philosophers lies at the foundation of our State school system, and is advanced as the strongest argument for its support, let us contemplate its extent and its influence as only a master mind could. Anything that we might write on a subject of such vast proportions, a subject requiring not only great learning, but the very highest order of intellect, would be lightly regarded, if regarded at all, by those who know the difficulties that are to be met in its treatment. We will, therefore, take the liberty of transcribing a long passage from Guizot's second lecture on civilization. It covers the whole ground, and should be read and re-read until its truths are indelibly stamped on the memory. Here it is:

“When we look at the civilizations which have preceded that of modern Europe, whether in Asia or elsewhere, including even those of Greece and Rome, it is impossible not to be struck with the unity of character which reigns among them. Each appears as though it had emanated from a single fact, from a single idea. One might almost assert that society was under the influence of one single principle, which universally prevailed and determined the character of its institutions, its manners, its opinions—in a word, all its developments.

“In Egypt, for example, it was the theocratic principle that took possession of society, and showed itself in its manners, in its monuments, and in all that has come down to us of Egyptian civilization. In India, the same phenomenon occurs—it is still a repetition of the almost exclusively prevailing influence of theocracy. In other regions a different organization may be observed—perhaps the domination of a conquering caste; and where such is the case, the principle of force takes entire possession of society, imposing upon it its laws and its character. In another place, perhaps, we discover society under the entire influence of the democratic principle; such was the case in the commercial republics which covered the coasts of Asia Minor and Syria—in Ionia and Phœnicia. In a word, whenever we contemplate the civilizations of the ancients, we find them all impressed with one ever-prevailing character of unity, visible in their institutions, their ideas and manners—one sole, or at least, one very preponderating influence, seems to govern and determine all things.

“We do not mean to aver that this overpowering influence of one single principle prevailed without any exception in the civil-

ization of those states. If we go back to their earliest history, we shall find that the various powers which dwelt in the bosom of these societies frequently struggled for mastery. Thus among the Egyptians, the Etruscans, even among the Greeks and others, we may observe the warrior caste struggling against that of the priests. In other places we find the spirit of clanship struggling against the spirit of free association, the spirit of aristocracy against popular rights. These struggles, however, mostly took place in periods beyond the reach of history, and no evidence of them is left beyond a vague tradition.

"Sometimes, indeed, these struggles broke out afresh at a later period in the history of the nations; but in almost every case they were quickly terminated by the victory of one of the powers which sought to prevail, and which then took sole possession of society. The war always ended by the domination of some special principle, which, if not exclusive, at least greatly preponderated. The co-existence and strife of various principles among these nations were no more than a passing, an accidental circumstance.

"From this cause a remarkable unity characterizes most of the civilizations of antiquity, the results of which, however, were very different. In one nation, as in Greece, the unity of the social principle led to a development of wonderful rapidity; no other people ever ran so brilliant a career in so short a time. But Greece had scarcely become glorious before she appeared worn out; her decline, if not quite so rapid as her rise, was strangely sudden. It seems as if the principle which called Greek civilization into life was exhausted. No other came to invigorate it, or supply its place.

"In other states, say, for instance, in India and Egypt, where again only one principle of civilization prevailed, the result was different. Society here became stationary; simplicity produced monotony; the country was not destroyed; society continued to exist; but there was no progression; it remained torpid and inactive.

"To this same cause must be attributed that character of tyranny which prevailed, under various names and the most opposite forms, in all the civilizations of antiquity. Society belonged to one *exclusive* power, which could bear with no other. Every principle of a different tendency was proscribed. The governing principle would nowhere suffer by its side the manifestation and influence of a rival principle.

"This character of simplicity, of unity, in their civilization, is equally impressed upon their literature and intellectual productions. Who that has run over the monuments of Hindoo literature lately introduced into Europe, but has seen that they are all

struck from the same die? They all seem the result of one same fact; the expression of one same idea. Religious and moral treatises, historical traditions, dramatic poetry, epics, all bear the same physiognomy. The same character of unity and monotony shines out in these works of mind and fancy, as we discover in their life and institutions. Even in Greece, notwithstanding the immense stores of knowledge and intellect which it poured forth, a wonderful unity still prevailed in all that related to literature and the arts."

Whoever reads this passage, into which is condensed the learning of volumes, will see the justness of the view taken by the naturalized citizen, and by every right-minded natural-born citizen. It is clear that history sustains the rejection of the means that lead to unity, and that patriotism demands their rejection. True, these means are not urged in the name of unity, but that it is their tendency, history amply attests. Their ostensible object is homogeneity. If there was a time when that object was reasonable, it is now passed. The immense population of the United States to-day is homogeneous, and, by the operation of a natural law, must continue to be so. This justification is too flimsy for serious consideration, and dismissing it to the darkness from which it sprung, we will bring to a close this already too lengthy article.

Having, however feebly, established our position, we would now ask these men and women who are so much better than their neighbors, "Have you any solid ground of complaint?" You have none. You are like the hypochondriac who rushes to the doctor for every little ill, real or imaginary, and who, by his constant complaints, makes every one around him miserable. A speech in the language of Schiller or a convivial gathering of Schiller's countrymen fills you with alarm and dismay. A verse from "Das Deutschen Vaterland," sung by an enthusiastic company of Teutons, produces a serious attack of homogeneity. An Orange riot or an alleged Clan-na-Gael assassination drives you frantic, and a bomb thrown by a man your principles have made mad, gives you an epileptic fit. A kind word about the Pope or the Jesuits afflicts you with delirium, and the sight of a parochial school induces an attack of hysteria. A congress of Catholic laymen or an assembly of Catholic bishops has the same effect on you that a red flag has on a bull. A remark against the State schools develops all the symptoms of hydrophobia. You foam at the mouth, you bark, you attempt to bite and you *hate water*.

What is the remedy for all these disorders? You call for unity—common sense and common honesty are what are needed—and as a means to this end, you would make education compulsory and

in common. Strange infatuation! You would save the Republic by destroying it! You would take individuals and families and form them into *one* compact whole. You would reduce to practice the doctrines of Plato and Aristotle, and precisely the same order of events would follow that followed their introduction into France. You would have a State, but it would be no longer the State that goes back of the Constitution, back of the Declaration of Independence, back of the Bill of Rights, back of Habeas Corpus, back of the Petition of Rights, back of the Magna Charta, back of the common law, back of all forms of our law, back, until the beauties of Paradise rise before our vision, and we hear the mandate of Omnipotence, with all that it implies, "Honor thy father and thy mother," ringing in the human heart—a mandate long afterwards promulgated amid the thunders and lightnings of Sinai—a mandate that is the corner-stone of every free government, and which cannot be rejected without destroying the moral order of the world. You would have a State, but it would be no longer the State with such grand historic barriers against the caprices and mad passions of majorities, and the foolish theories of ignorant or degraded men, whose conception of liberty and law is contemptible. You would have a State, but it would be no longer the state of diverse ideas and sentiments, of clashing opinions, of varied elements, habits, aspirations—one in essentials, free in non-essentials, charitable in all things. You would have a State, but it would be no longer the republican State—the State of Washington and Jefferson—the State that cherishes no utopias—that looks for no millennium—that, founded in nature and reason, concedes the fullest liberty springing from them compatible with its safety, and that provides and inflicts punishment on those who violate its rights, and the rights of *man as man*.

The State you would give has been weighed in the balance and found wanting. The people of Asia and of Greece and Rome had it, and Guizot traces for us, with a master hand, its enervating, degrading and blighting influence on them. The people of France had it, and we behold "the bloodiest picture in the book of time." Well, indeed, did the monster Barère call it the government of the guillotine. "The guillotine," he said, "does all; the guillotine governs." "The gradation of their republic," says Edmund Burke, "is laid in moral paradoxes. All those instances to be found in history, whether real or fabulous, of a doubtful public spirit, at which morality is perplexed, reason is staggered, and from which affrighted nature recoils, are their chosen and almost sole examples for the instruction of their youth."

In the name of the fathers of the Republic and of Christian civ-

ilization, whose *chef d'œuvre* the Republic is, we protest against the introduction of any principle, upon any pretext whatsoever, that would lead to such a State. The circumstances which so afflict and affright you do not call for it, and if they did, it could only be reared on the ruins of the Republic and of Christian civilization. This being so, the remedy would be worse than the disease. The Republic gone, Christian civilization maimed and bleeding, you would have to drink to the dregs the poisoned cup that your ignorance or corruption pressed to other lips.

But we turn from the contemplation of so terrible a calamity. We have too much faith in the intelligence and virtue of the American people to believe that they would cripple, if not destroy, the Republic by the introduction of a principle that is at war with Christian civilization—the civilization that has braved the storm of nineteen hundred years, and that is to-day fast marching to universal conquest. Anxious as they are for a public system of education, they will have none that is not based on justice to all, and that is not in harmony with liberty as the founders of the Republic understood it. When they shall have secured such a system, we will say with St. Paul's noble prelate, "Withered be the hand raised in sign of its destruction."

EDGAR ALLAN POE.

EDGAR ALLAN POE was born in Boston on 19th February, 1809. His family was a very old Norman one, which settled in Ireland in the reign of the second Henry, so that the poet was certainly of Irish descent. The name originally was La Poer, its founder in Ireland being Sir Roger La Poer, marshal to Prince John, in the memorable reign referred to. Like many old Irish names, it lost its original form and became as we find it at present. The poet's great-grandfather emigrated from Ireland to America some time in the middle of the last century, bringing with him his wife and a son, David, who was then a mere child. As this boy David ripened into manhood, he acquired a taste for the profession of arms, and served with great distinction during the Revolution, attaining the high rank of General, and becoming an intimate friend of Lafayette. General Poe married a Pennsylvania lady of great beauty, by whom he had several children; one of these children, David, became the father of the poet.

Young David was sent to study law in Baltimore. He does not seem to have been a very attentive student, however, for at the age of eighteen, being sent to Norfolk on business, he fell in love with a young and pretty actress, named Elizabeth Arnold, whom he persuaded to marry him, to the great chagrin of his parents, who, naturally enough, could not countenance such an indiscreet proceeding on the part of their eldest son. But, nothing daunted, he joined the company of which his wife was a distinguished member, and contented himself with playing in very minor parts; as time went on he improved in his new profession, taking leading parts in Shakespearian drama, and it was while playing an engagement of this kind, at the Boston Theatre, that the poet was born, his birth being followed by two others.

In 1811 Mrs. Poe died, and very soon afterward occurred the death of her husband. The three children were thus left to the mercy of the world, and it is satisfactory to know that they all found respectable and kind protectors, Edgar being adopted by Mr. Allan, of Richmond, which was the place of his mother's death.

Mr. Allan was a wealthy merchant, and the kindness shown by him and his wife to the destitute child was remarkable; they were too kind to him, in fact. It was a mistaken good-heartedness to allow him his own wild will in every particular, and as he grew up to boyhood he manifested in many ways the forwardness of his

disposition, which they admired as a high spirit which no one should venture to break. It would have been much better, for the happiness of his future career, had they put even a slight curb on the high-spiritedness, which they admired so much and so erroneously.

The future poet received the rudiments of education in one of the first seminaries of Richmond, presided over by a widow lady, who found young Edgar rather difficult of management, and with a positive disinclination to be bound by any formal code of rules, though administered by the most respectable of widow ladies; and in this, as in everything else, he was warmly supported by his adopted father.

When the boy had completed his seventh year, he was taken from the seminary to accompany his foster-parents to England, who placed him at school at Stoke-Newington, where he remained until he had attained the age of thirteen. This school and its master are described by Poe in one of the most curious of his tales, "William Wilson." At this school he made fair progress in classical and mathematical subjects, but not very extraordinary for a boy of his superior intelligence and mental power. He was, however, noted for his extreme love and proficiency in all physical recreations, whether of the field or the gymnasium.

Arrived at his thirteenth year, he returned to the Allans in Richmond; at this time he was an extremely handsome boy, gracefully formed, with a remarkably intellectual face and wonderful, large, beaming eyes. The love of his protectors was, if anything, stronger on his return from England, and they humored him in every particular, Mr. Allan taking especial delight in the doggerel verses which about this time he began to produce, the source of inspiration generally being some individual who had given him offense, real or imaginary, more often, indeed, the latter. All his time, however, was not given to idleness and scathing doggerel. He still pursued his studies under the first masters in Richmond, told extraordinary stories, *extempore*, and declaimed poetry with remarkable vigor and elocutionary effect.

If the young poet was sensitive to insult or neglect, he was equally so with regard to kindness or any slight attention paid him; and one of his deepest friendships was formed at this time, and in the following manner: Visiting one day a schoolmate to whom he was attached, the lady of the house, on entering the room where he was, took his hand and spoke some kindly words of welcome, which touched the boy's heart so much that for some minutes he was unable to reply. For this lady he had the deepest and most ideal affection, confiding to her all his boyish troubles and sorrows; she seems to have understood his delicate tempera-

ment better than any of his acquaintances, and whilst she lived, exerted a gentle and charming influence over his impressionable nature. Death soon deprived him of this most valuable friend, for whom his grief was unbounded, and for months after her interment, he went, night after night, to mourn in the darkness by her silent tomb. She it was who suggested the ideal "Helen" of his most beautiful youthful poem.

When just seventeen years old he was sent to the University of Virginia, which, we learn, was then a most dissolute place, and some of his biographers have stated that Poe entered so thoroughly into the practices of dissipation rampant there, as to entirely neglect his studies, and finally was expelled. Now all this is not by any means true. He gambled a good deal, certainly, but was not by any means a drunkard, although his champagne bills were pretty heavy. He was fond of entertaining his companions, and we daresay they did not object to drinking champagne at his expense, or to speak more correctly, at the expense of his guardian. A fellow-student, who was afterwards Secretary of the Faculty of the University, states, "that Poe was tolerably regular in his attendance at class, and that at the final examination he obtained the very highest honors; also, that never at any period did he fall under the censure of the Faculty."

On leaving the University, Poe returned to the Allans, and did not find Mr. Allan ready to praise the liberal manner in which he had spent his money. However, he settled down and prepared a small volume of poems for publication, which Mr. Allan paid for. This volume, published in Baltimore in 1829, contained "Al Aaraaf," "Tamerlane," and some minor poems; it did not attract much attention at the time, yet, notwithstanding many crudities, it undoubtedly gave promise of future excellence.

Asked to choose a profession, he, like his distinguished grandfather, chose that of arms, and a cadetship was procured for him at West Point Military Academy. He did not find the study of tactics agreeable; well, he had an easy remedy at hand, and he availed himself of it, namely, not to study tactics. The time which should have been employed in reading up the science of war was devoted to idleness, writing local squibs, which were much relished by his comrades, and, unfortunately, drinking, not champagne, but what was far more ruinous to him, brandy. It is a melancholy fact that at this time he began to manifest an unfortunate inclination for over-indulgence in stimulants.

This would not do in a Military Academy, and in January, 1831, he was brought before a court-martial on two charges, "Neglect of Duty" and "Disobedience of Orders"; he pleaded guilty and was dismissed from the service of the United States. Things now

looked bad for Poe; Mrs. Allan was dead, Mr. Allen had married again, and a son and heir had been born unto him, so that the poet would have been an intruder in his former home. He determined to publish a volume of poems by subscription; the price was two and a half dollars a copy, which every one of his former comrades paid in advance. They were greatly disappointed in the book on its appearance, as it contained none of the squibs and satires which they evidently expected; they showed a lack of poetic taste in this, as the volume contained the germs of some of his best pieces.

The profits of this work did not last very long, and the unfortunate poet, soon found himself in decidedly straitened circumstances. He called at Mr. Allan's house, one day, learned from Mrs. Allan that her husband was ill; and naturally enough expressed a wish to see him—to this wish the lady would not accede, and positively denied him admission to her husband's room. We can picture both, each fancying the other an intruder, undoubtedly; and poor Poe mentally contrasting the present, with the former Mrs. Allan. Can we wonder that a scene ensued? That the poet left the house in a rage? That Mrs. Allan complained to her husband of Poe's insolence? with the result that he was forbidden the house.

For two years after this, Poe's doings are involved in considerable obscurity; how he managed to live is a mystery which all his biographers have vainly tried to solve. The most probable solution is, that he went to Baltimore where his brother was, and lived the life of a literary hack; certain it is, that in 1833, he was a successful competitor for two prizes, offered for the best tale and poem by the *Saturday Visitor*, published in that city. The proprietors of this journal showed especial kindness to Poe, and recommended him to the *Southern Literary Messenger*, for which he wrote some of his best tales; becoming editor in 1835. It was at this period of his career that he married his beautiful cousin, Virginia Clemm—she was a delicate, extremely amiable girl, and if anything poorer than himself.

His connection with the *Messenger* terminated in 1837, and it is to be regretted owing greatly to his own weakness; like our own Mangin, he could not shake off the thralldom of the Drink Fiend, although he made many efforts to do so. After breaking off with the *Messenger*, he and his wife went to Baltimore, where they staid but a very short time, going from thence to Philadelphia, and on to New York, where he published his longest story, "Arthur Gordon Pym," which attained a greater success in England than in America. It is an extraordinary story, written with such attention to the minutest details and completest vraisemblance, that

many English papers accepted it in real good faith, and vied with each other in copying and setting forth the marvellous discoveries of the imaginary Pym; which was just the effect Poe intended and gloried in.

Soon after this Poe returned to Philadelphia where he accepted the editorship of *The Gentleman's Magazine*, in which appeared numerous criticisms from his pen, some poems and several of his very best stories. His connection with this journal lasted exactly a year, and its severance was partly due to his old failing—though not altogether, for he had several disputes with its proprietor, relating to the scathing nature of his criticisms. This journal lived but a few months after Poe's departure; its proprietor evidently regretted him, for on starting a new magazine he offered him its editorship, which he accepted.

This was *Graham's Magazine*, with which he was connected for over a year and a half. He strove hard to obtain an appointment from the Government, and being unsuccessful, went to New York, where he became sub-editor and general critic for the *Mirror*, a paper of which N. P. Willis was part proprietor, and who records his experience of Poe in the following manner: "With his pale, beautiful, and intellectual face as a reminder of what genius was in him, it was impossible, of course, not to treat him always with deferential courtesy; and to an occasional request that he would not probe too deep in a criticism, or that he would erase a passage colored too highly with his resentments against society and mankind, he readily and courteously assented, far more yielding than most men, we thought, on points so excusably sensitive. With a prospect of taking the lead in another periodical he at last voluntarily gave up his employment with us."

It is a pity poor Poe did not always meet with men like Willis, who being a distinguished poet himself, and a thoroughly sensible man—was well qualified to manage the restless spirit of his greater brother-poet. Before entering on his editorial duties for the *Broadway Journal*, which is the periodical referred to by Willis, Poe published "The Raven" in the *American Review*, and for this splendid poem, which immediately caused an unparalleled sensation over the literary world, he received the munificent sum of ten dollars. After a short time he became sole proprietor of the *Broadway Journal*, a fact which ought to have made American versifiers tremble; and with good reason, for never before was such criticising heard of—it was the genuine tomahawk and vitriol style, often unfair; but it undoubtedly annihilated whole hosts of literary pretenders.

The turbulent existence of the *Broadway Journal* lasted but a year, and Poe betook himself to writing critical articles for a mag-

azine called the *Ladies' Book*. His society at this time was much sought after in high-class literary circles, and many have recorded their recollections of his refined manner and brilliant conversational powers. He was always accompanied by his wife, who at times was extremely delicate. Her gentle manner and almost ethereal beauty made friends for her everywhere. We cannot help selecting a few passages from a letter written by Mrs. Frances Osgood, the graceful poetess, in which she describes Poe and his wife in their own home. "It was in his own simple, yet poetical home, that the character of Edgar Poe appeared in its most beautiful light. Playful, affectionate, witty—alternately docile and wayward as a petted child—for his young, gentle, idolized wife and for all who came, he had, even in the midst of his most harassing literary duties, a kind word, a pleasant smile, a graceful and courteous attention. At his desk, beneath the romantic picture of his loved and lost Lenore, he would sit hour after hour, patient, assiduous, and uncomplaining, tracing in an exquisitely clear chirography, and with almost superhuman swiftness, the lightning thoughts, the 'rare and radiant' fancies, as they flashed through his wonderful and ever-wakeful brain."

His wife's health becoming still more frail, the poet took her to a charming cottage, delightfully situated in Fordham, near New York. Here he was surrounded by all that he loved most passionately in Nature, birds, flowers and waving trees; and he was often to be seen strolling meditatively amongst the tall pines, or seated on some rocky ledge gazing in silent rapture on the peaceful landscape which surrounded his cottage.

But amidst all this beauty and tranquillity, a dread shadow stalked ominously; for his adored wife was dying fast, and all the power in Nature could not save her. Her mother came and watched with the poet by her bedside—watched the young life ebbing slowly but surely away—he became ill and they were reduced to a pitiful state of poverty. Willis called attention to this in the *Home Journal* and a sum of money was raised, which at least afforded the family temporary relief. He recovered, but in a few weeks the spirit of his loved Virginia passed away.

Some months after her death, he settled down to the composition of his prose poem "Eureka," in which he aimed at solving the great problem of the Universe, and, as Mr. Stoddard remarks, "solved it to his own satisfaction, not like a man of science, which he was not, but like a poet." About this time he published "Ulahume," a requiem for his wife, and in 1848, "Eureka" was published, but without making the great sensation its author expected. After its publication he delivered several lectures, and kept on writing for the magazine. It was a fruitful literary time with him;

the beautiful blank verse poem, "To Helen," "The Bell," "For Annie," and "Annabel Lee," being amongst his productions at this period.

In the summer of 1849, he started from his cottage at Fordham for Richmond. On reaching Philadelphia he met with some old companions, and the result was, that he spent every cent in his possession in their company; having to borrow what was sufficient to take him on to Richmond. What he did with himself on his first arrival at Richmond is a question on which many speculations have been based; he certainly was very short of money, and we think it must have been at this time that the following peculiar incident took place. We copy it verbatim from a slip which we extracted from the *Evening Telegraph*, but the date of which we have lost: "A correspondent in the *New York Critic* has lately called attention to the poem published some years ago in the *Despatch*, of Kokomo, a little town in the State of Indiana. The poem is or was in the possession of an inhabitant of Kokomo, whose grandfather kept an inn in Chesterfield, a little village near Richmond, Virginia. One night, a young man who showed plainly the marks of dissipation, appeared at the door and requested a room, if one could be given him. He retired, and the inn saw no more of him; for when they went to call him the following morning he had disappeared, leaving only a book, on the fly-leaf of which was the following poem, written in Roman characters and almost as legible as print itself. The manuscript contains not a single erasure, nor a single interlineated word, and is signed "E. A. P." The peculiarity of the writing, the description of the young man, and the characteristics of the poem, point to Poe as the author. The poem is entitled "Leonainie" and is as follows:

"Leonainie—angels named her,
And they took the light
Of the laughing stars, and framed her
In a smile of white;
And they made her hair of gloomy
Midnight, and her eyes of bloomy
Moonshine, and they brought her to me
In a solemn night.

"In a solemn night of summer,
When my heart of gloom
Blossomed up to greet the comer,
Like a rose in bloom;
All forebodings that distressed me
I forgot, as joy caressed me,
Lying joy that caught and pressed me
In the arms of doom!

“ Only spake the little lisper
In the angel tongue,
Yet I, listening, heard the whisper,
Songs are only sung
Here below, that they may grieve you.
Tales are told you to deceive you,
So must Leonainie leave you
While her love is young!

“ Then God smiled and it was morning,
Matchless and supreme;
Heaven's glory seemed adorning
Earth with its esteem;
Every heart but mine seemed gifted
With the voice of prayer, and lifted
When my Leonainie drifted
From me like a dream.”

This beautiful poem is not to be found in any of the editions of Poe's works; and our opinion is that no edition should claim completeness without it. His poems are too few to allow the loss even of the most inconsiderable or least valuable; and certainly the above poem does not enter into that category; it has all the characteristics of Poe at his very best and we do not believe any other American poet could have written it.

After several days he turned up at the office of his old paper, *The Messenger*, which a friend of his, a Mr. Thompson, was then editing. This gentleman treated Poe with considerable kindness and gave him a desk in *The Messenger* office, at which to carry on his literary work, which he did zealously for some time. He made desperate efforts to reform, and at last joined a temperance society—renewed his acquaintance with one of his youthful loves to whom he became engaged and all went merry as a wedding-bell—until business unfortunately called him to Philadelphia.

He started from Richmond in the first days of October, 1849. At some of the stations on the way he met some friends, and all his good resolutions dissolved into thin air. On arriving at Baltimore he was in a semi-delirious condition. An exciting election was taking place; some political agents who were on the lookout for voters perceived him, and in a spirit of thorough ruffianism seized and drugged the unfortunate poet. They then made him record his vote in several different polling-booths, treating him with such violence that he died from its effects in a hospital, to which he had been removed, on the 7th of October, 1849. So died he who has been well-termed the “Prince of American Poets.”

It is very difficult to write anything new about the poetry of Edgar Poe. It has been lauded, perhaps excessively, and certainly criticized illiberally, and in both fashions by many whose

opinions on other subjects have been deemed worthy of serious consideration. No amount of praise can make a mediocre work permanently popular, nor can unjust criticism keep a really good work in the background. Admitting (as we must from hosts of examples in literature) the truth of both these propositions, we arrive at the conclusion that if a work outlives its critics and retains its hold on the popular taste, its excellence must, of necessity, be of a superior kind.

The merits of Poe's poetry were never so intellectually appreciated as they are at the present day—and this, notwithstanding the ephemeral sensation caused by poets of the strictly philosophic order, as we understand them, didactic versifiers and metaphysical, which latter is of all schools of poetry, the most absurd. A lesson may occasionally be taught in verse, we will not say in poetry, but prose is undoubtedly the only medium by which to impart metaphysics; being a science, it is in direct opposition to poetry.

In his poems Poe seeks neither to instruct nor to be metaphysical. He believed in "the poem which is a poem and nothing more; the poem written solely for the poem's sake," and he was undoubtedly correct. Nothing but the poem written for its own sake, written to give a lasting though imperfect embodiment to those glimpses of the loveliness which is not of the earth and which none but the true poet in his moods of inspiration, perceives, possesses the power of elevating other souls in the faintest degree; and the extent to which a poem possesses this power should form the principal basis of poetic criticism. Form, in its various details, although a secondary consideration, is nevertheless of very great importance. Still Hegel's assertion that "Metre is the first and only condition absolutely demanded by poetry," is not wholly correct. Metre is a condition absolutely demanded by poetry, but it is by no means the first and only condition essential to "the rhythmical creation of beauty," which is Poe's own definition of poetry. To this definition he adheres in all his poems. Even in those few which we cannot peruse without a shuddering sensation, we find elements of beauty in a true but almost indefinite form.

The range of ideal perception in his poetry is proportional to the domain in which he reigned and revelled—

A wild weird clime that lieth sublime,
Out of Space—out of Time.

Of this "ultimate dim Thule," and of the mysteries which lie beyond the tomb he loved to sing of love vanished from earth and the hope of its renewal after death.

The "Raven" is undoubtedly his best-known poem. We read somewhere that it is the best-known poem in the English language, and we are inclined to think it is. It is certainly the most unique, and it is certainly more than "a triumph of mechanism," as Mr. Nicholls (believing implicitly no doubt Poe's philosophy of composition) calls it.¹ It is, in our opinion, a masterpiece of serio-grotesque poetry; the grotesque element being introduced with the most consummate artistic judgment in such a manner as not to clash with the spirit of profound melancholy which pervades the poem; the "sorrow for the lost Lenore," of which the bird of ill-omen is made allegorical; the sorrow which is ever present, as we read in the last verse:

"And the Raven, never flitting, still is sitting, still is sitting
On the pallid bust of Pallas just above my chamber door;
And his eyes have all the seeming of a demon's that is dreaming,
And the lamplight o'er him streaming throws his shadow on the floor;
And my soul from out that shadow that lies floating on the floor
Shall be lifted—nevermore!"

The peculiarity of the versification of this poem and its remarkable suitability to the subject has impressed all readers. The stanzas to Helen, written at a very early age, have elicited the admiration of even his severest critics, and it would be difficult to find a more graceful lyric. We quote it in its entirety:

"Helen, thy beauty is to me
Like those Nicaen barks of yore,
That gently o'er a perfumed sea
The weary way-worn wanderer bore
To his own native shore,

"On desperate seas long wont to roam
Thy hyacinth hair, thy classic face,
Thy Naiad airs have brought me home
To the glory that was Greece
And the grandeur that was Rome.

Lo! in yon brilliant window niche
How statue-like I see thee stand,
The agate lamp within thy hand.
Ah! Psyche, from the regions, which
Are Holy Land!"

The last two lines of the second stanza have always been especial favorites of ours. The whole tone of the poem is richly ideal.

Al Aaraaf, his longest poem, and written in youth, although somewhat unequal, contains, nevertheless, some extremely beau-

¹ Nicholls' *American Literature*.

tiful passages, and is decidedly worthy of a careful reading. The following passage contains much unearthly beauty:

"Sound loves to revel in a summer night;
Witness the murmur of the gray twilight
That stole upon the ear, in Eyraco
Of many a wild star-gazer long ago—
That stealeth ever on the ear of him
Who, musing, gazeth on the distance dim,
And sees the darkness coming as a cloud—
Is not its form—its voice—most palpable and loud?"

In a note he says: "I have often thought I could distinctly hear the sound of the darkness as it stole over the horizon." It may seem an absurd fancy to ordinary mortals, but we must remember that poets are not ordinary mortals, seeing and hearing with other eyes and ears, sights and sounds not perceptible to the mere physical organs.

Tamerlane, another youthful poem, is a vivid portrayal of burning ambition, in a heart which also loves deeply; the ambition is not wholly selfish, as the following passage tells:

"I spoke to her of power and pride,
But mystically—in such guise
That she might deem it naught beside
The moment's converse; in her eyes
I read, perhaps too carelessly—
A mingled feeling with my own—
The flush on her bright cheek, to me
Seemed to become a queenly throne.
Too well, that I should let it be
Light in the wilderness alone."

This poem has many other fine passages which shine out redeemingly amidst the occasional crudities of the, as yet, undeveloped poetic artist.

Three poems and the fragment of a drama are the only attempts made by Poe in blank verse. The three poems are "The Coliseum," "To Helen," and the lines beginning "Not long ago." The "Coliseum" is a lofty inspiration, and it may be interesting to know that its author was never near Rome at any time. We can only give the opening lines:

"Type of the antique Rome! Rich reliquary
Of lofty contemplation left to Time
By buried centuries of pomp and power!
At length—at length—after so many days
Of weary pilgrimage and burning thirst
(Thirst for the springs of lore that in thee lie),
I kneel, an altered and an humble man
Amid thy shadows, and so drink within
Thy very soul, thy grandeur, gloom and glory!"

This lofty tone, so thoroughly in keeping with the subject of the poem, is maintained with great vigor throughout.

The poem, "To Helen," is one of the most beautiful ever written in blank verse, which is such a dangerous style for mediocre writers to attempt, and in which even great writers have failed. Cunning devices of rhyme and rhythm often clothe and beautify ideas, which in blank verse would seem the merest platitudes. Poe could not write dramatic blank verse (which he found out for himself), but he could write it in its most purely poetic style—as Shelly has written it in "Prometheus Unbound," and it is a thing to be regretted that he wrote so little of it. Such passages as the following are unsurpassable :

"It was a July midnight ; and from out
A full-orbed moon, that like thine own soul, soaring
Sought a precipitate pathway up through heaven,
There fell a silvery-silken veil of light,
With quietude, and sultriness, and slumber,
Upon the upturned faces of a thousand
Roses that grew in an enchanted garden,
Where no wind dared to stir, unless on tiptoe—
Fell on the upturned faces of these roses
That gave out in return for the love-light,
Their odorous souls in an ecstatic death—

And further on we meet the following exquisite lines :

"The pearly lustre of the moon went out ;
The mossy banks and the meandering paths,
The happy flowers and the repining trees
Were seen no more : the very roses' odors
Died in the arms of the adoring airs."

This last idea is, indeed, the very essence of true poetry. His other blank verse poem is scarcely less beautiful. The "Bells" is almost as well known as the "Raven," and holds an equally unique place in our language ; it is more than a masterpiece of verbal melody—it is as near an attempt at harmony as language will ever allow.

Annabel Lee is one of the poems inspired by the deep sorrow with which the death of his wife affected him. It is in his most musical style and not too long to quote entire :

"It was many and many a year ago
In a kingdom by the sea
That a maiden there lived whom you may know
By the name of Annabel Lee ;
And this maiden, she lived with no other thought
Than to love and be loved by me.

"I was a child and she was a child,
 In this kingdom by the sea;
 But we loved with a love which was more than love—
 I and my Annabel Lee;
 With a love which the winged seraphs of heaven
 Coveted her and me.

"And this was the reason that long ago,
 In this kingdom by the sea,
 A wind blew out of a cloud, chilling
 My beautiful Annabel Lee;
 So that her high-born kinsman came,
 And bore her away from me,
 To shut her up in a sepulchre
 In this kingdom by the sea.

"The angels, not half so happy in heaven,
 Went envying her and me—
 Yes! that was the reason (as all men know,
 In this kingdom by the sea)
 That the wind came out of the cloud by night,
 Chilling and killing my Annabel Lee.

"But our love it was stronger by far than the love
 Of those who were older than we—
 Of many far wiser than we—
 And neither the angels in heaven above,
 Nor the demons down under the sea,
 Can ever dissever my soul from the soul
 Of the beautiful Annabel Lee.

"For the moon never beams without bringing me dreams
 Of the beautiful Annabel Lee;
 And the stars never rise but I feel the bright eyes
 Of the beautiful Annabel Lee;
 And so, all the night tide, I lie down by the side
 Of my darling—my darling—my life and my bride,
 In her sepulchre there by the sea
 In her tomb by the side of the sea."

"Malume" was also written as a requiem for his dead wife; the supreme sorrow which is its theme, can best be understood by one who has strayed abstractedly near to the burial-place of some loved one, and suddenly recognizes his whereabouts. The sonorousness of the words in this poem; the peculiar rhythmic flow and constant use of repetend, combine in making it one of the weirdest poems in the language. It has been said that even if read to a person who did not in the least understand the English tongue, its mere rhythmic and verbal effects would cause a sensation of weird sorrow.

"The City in the Sea," "The Conqueror Worm," "The Sleeper," "For Annie and Lenore," are about his weirdest poems, but can only receive passing mention, although each has particular charms of its own to recommend it. "The Haunted Palace," which is introduced into "The Fall of the House of Usher," is a very beau-

tiful and delicate piece of imagination subtly embodying the conception of a rare and superior intellect overthrown. We cannot help quoting it in full :

“ In the greenest of our valleys
By good angels tenanted,
Once a fair and stately palace—
Radiant palace—reared its head,
In the monarch Thought’s dominion—
It stood there !
Never seraph spread a pinion
Over fabric half so fair !

“ Banners yellow, glorious, golden,
On its roof did float and flow ;
(This—all this—was in the olden
Time long ago)
And every gentle air that dallied,
In that sweet day,
Along the ramparts plumed and pallid
A winged odor went away.

“ Wanderers in that happy valley,
Through two luminous windows, saw
Spirits moving musically,
To a lute’s well tuned law ;
Round about a throne where, sitting
(Porphyrogene !)
In state his glory well-befitting,
The ruler of the realm was seen.

“ And all with pearl and ruby glowing
Was the fair palace door,
Through which came flowing, flowing, flowing
And sparkling evermore,
A troop of Echoes, whose sweet duty
Was but to sing
In voices of surpassing beauty,
The wit and wisdom of their king.

But evil things in robes of sorrow,
Assailed the monarch’s high estate,
(Ah, let us mourn ! for never morrow
Shall dawn upon him desolate !)
And round about his home the glory
That blushed and bloomed,
Is but a dim-remembered story
Of the old time entombed.

And travellers now within that valley,
Through the red-litten windows see
Vast forms that move fantastically
To a discordant melody,
While, like a ghastly rapid river
Through the pale door,
A hideous throng rush out forever
And laugh—but smile no more.

Only the most consummate poetic genius could produce a poem

like this on such a theme. For its full appreciation, however, it is necessary to read the fascinating story with which it is connected. Even standing apart from the story, and on its own merits, solely, its delightfully imaginative spirit possesses an almost indefinable charm.

The last of his poems which we will quote is one of the tenderest and most charming lyrics he ever penned. It is inscribed—"To One in Paradise."

"Thou wast that all to me, love,
For which my soul did pine—
A green isle in the sea, love,
A fountain and a shrine,
All wreathed with fairy fruits and flowers
And all the flowers were mine.

"Ah, dream too bright to last!
Ah, starry Hope! that didst arise
But to be overcast!
A voice from out the Future cries,
'On! On!'—but o'er the Past
(Dim gulf!) my spirit hovering lies
Mute, motionless, aghast!

"For, alas! alas! with me
The light of life is o'er!
'No more—no more—no more—'
(Such language holds the solemn sea
To the sands upon the shore)
Shall bloom the thunder-blasted tree
Or the stricken eagle soar!

"And all my days are trances,
And all my nightly dreams
Are where thy dark eye glances,
And where the footstep gleams—
In what ethereal dances,
By what eternal streams,"

The above selection contains much of what we think his most beautiful and unfamiliar work—unfamiliar certainly to ordinary readers, the majority of whom only know "The Raven" and "The Bells." This certainly ought not to be the case with any person who has the least pretension to poetic taste. Poe can be read with pleasure and delight at times, when the works of greater but heavier poets would be almost intolerable. Shelley, in "The Skylark," says, "Our sweetest songs are those that tell of saddest thought," and the poems of Poe are the most sweetly sad in our language, though he mourns for love and beauty passed from earth, he ever looks hopefully to a more lasting and more beautiful restoration beyond the tomb. He certainly ranks as America's greatest lyric poet—no other American lyrist even remotely approaching him.

It would be impossible within the limits of this paper to do

even scant justice to his fascinating and beautifully-written tales, many of which possess much of that weird and magical spirit which animates his poetry. His tales of this class are master-pieces, as it was undoubtedly his natural style of writing. To this class belong "*Lisica*," "*The Fall of the House of Usher*," "*The Assignation*," and "*The Masque of the Red Death*." There are many others, but these four are the best. Then there are tales such as "*The Mystery of Marie Roget*," "*The Murders in the Rue Morgue*," "*The Gold Bug*," and "*The Purloined Letter*," which display a marvellous deductive power. An individual would possess a most unusual nervous organization who could read such tales as "*The Facts in the Case of M. Valdemar*," "*The Black Cat*," and others of this class, without experiencing a thrill of genuine terror. His humorous tales are not so good, by any means, this style of writing always appearing forced in him.

Most of his critiques and essays are well worth reading and will be appreciated by persons of a logical turn of mind. His "*Philosophy of Composition*" is interesting and ingenious, but all its assertions are not, by any means, to be implicitly believed. Of more value is his essay on "*The Poetic Principle*," which contains the following remarkable estimate of the present Poet Laureate; remarkable when we consider that Poe's critical genius leaned more to the depreciatory than to the laudatory side. "From Alfred Tennyson—although in perfect sincerity I regard him as the noblest poet that ever lived,—I have left myself time to cite only a very brief specimen. I call him and think him the noblest of poets, not because the impressions he produces are at *all* times the most profound, not because the poetical excitement which he induces is at *all* times the most intense, but because it is, at all times, the most ethereal; in other words, the most elevating and the most pure. No poet is so little of the earth, earthy."

With this extract we are compelled to bring this paper to a close. We have merely tried to bring before our readers in the plainest manner, the most salient features of the poet's life, and to point out some beauties in his poems, which have not hitherto been specially referred to.

From a careful study of his life and character we say, and honestly believe, that no other poet has been so grossly maligned. He had faults—he were not human otherwise—but they were such as pass unnoticed in thousands of other men, or at most arouse but our sympathy. He wandered amongst the thronging millions, "*Dreaming dreams no mortal ever dared to dream before*," and the dull realities of earthly existence weighed heavily upon him. In our judgment of him, we must consider all these things in the spirit not alone of Charity, but also of Justice.

THE PAGANISM OF CÆSAR.

BROADLY speaking, the office of the law of the land is to deal with the rights and wrongs of individuals and of society. It does not profess to deal with every wrong of either, nor is it competent to do so with or without any such profession. It cannot reach all the wants of individuals, or of society. It aims, here and there, to protect virtue where it can, and at times to punish vice where some other person is wronged by it. It cannot teach morals, but it gives its aid, with its own lights, to what seems morality, and represses certain forms of immorality.

The State behind this law accepts God's moral law as it finds it, but it is neither able to interpret that law, nor to add to, nor diminish its provisions. In so far as this moral law is the measure of man's daily secular life, the civil power, the temporal power, is without office or jurisdiction. These large and most important duties fall within the spiritual order, and for them it is the province of the spiritual order—the Church—to legislate.

This division will not be accepted by those who do not recognize any King but Cæsar. For them the State or temporal order is a guide for the present life, leaving the regulations for the next life or for any other state of existence out of the question. Even for many who recognize a spiritual as well as a temporal order of things there is the overshadowing omnipotence of the State before which all mere spiritual regulations must give way. These indirectly put themselves as completely within and under the civil power as if there was no other. Of the two orders existing side by side, each independent of the other in its own sphere, and each supreme within its own sphere, but both closely connected and coming from the same God, there should theoretically be nothing but harmony; but when one comes to consider that every human act reaches out and touches the infinite and has its spiritual as well as human side, and that a multitude of human acts are obviously contained within the spiritual, one is not at a loss to see how easily conflicts may arise, and how readily a case may be found the settlement of which would be claimed by one of two co-ordinate powers.¹ "The Church within its rights, and the State over all," is not so often heard as it is meant to be heard. "The Church within its rights and the State to judge of those rights" is that

¹ The Encyclical *Immortale Dei*, November, 1885, is the perfect pronouncement on this subject.

species of modern atheism that is so acceptable to the world. The Church and the State cannot be co-ordinate without conflict. If the State is to define the limits of all law then, not only can it legislate in the spiritual order, but it can legislate all churches and all morality out of legal existence. That would be the worse extreme because no matter what *ultra vires* ordinances the spiritual power would make, they could never be carried into effect without the aid of the civil executive.

Even in this utilitarian point of view, the superiority should be accorded to the spiritual power; but from the nature of things the spiritual authority should be paramount in spiritual matters, else there is an end to all consistency. Granting that the temporal order is from the same God, the spiritual is intrinsically as high above it, as the things of heaven are superior to the things of earth.

It is not intended, however, here to discuss the orders temporal and spiritual, but to state as a fact, what must be admitted in the long run, that in every question of a spiritual kind the final authority to decide lies in the spiritual and not in the temporal order, for if one is to obey God rather than man, the former is superior to the latter. This doctrine of the Catholic Church works no harm in practice, but simply gives God His place in the Church, as well as in the State. All laws to be binding must come from Him, and if there are many nations of the temporal order under His eye, there is, as Catholics believe, one Spiritual Commonwealth—one Church to which He has entrusted the spiritual government of the nations and of mankind individually. "For it is not enough to say with Carlyle, after many German philosophers had thought it, and the Hegelian synthesis had given it a recognizable name, that the world is a system with one life flowing into all its veins and arteries and binding up the elements thereby, lest they fall into hopeless disorder. This half truth may, and in the course of time must, have for a consequence the absorption of the individual's body and soul into the devouring State. This half truth needs yet to be completed by affirming that God is the Life of that life and deals directly with every human soul."¹

What the Church teaches in spiritual matters is to be held above all human temporal law—not only because that law is unable to interpret or execute spiritual matters, but also because it is a usurpation of the prerogative of the Divine Commonwealth—the Church whose privilege and duty and mission it is to expound and enforce the moral law and determine its own sole and unfettered jurisdiction with reference thereto.

¹ *Dublin Review*, vol. xxxi., pp. 194–195.

The militant Church in this as in a thousand other matters has to combat the usurpations and encroachments of the civil order in matters specially within her own jurisdiction. It is the purpose of this paper to draw attention to some of these and to treat them from the point of view of a lawyer, and not that of a theologian or churchman.

First of all the State may say to itself, as did the unwise builders of old, "Come, let us make a city and a tower the top whereof may reach to heaven," though, as happened on the plain of Sennaar, they may cease to build the city, and may be scattered over the face of the earth. They may not understand one another's speech, though before they were of one tongue and of the same speech. They will have done no more than raise a monument to confusion. This has been the great, the sublime, so to speak, effort of the post-mediæval age. By one bold step a nation usurps all spiritual rights, and proposes to establish by its own potency a spiritual order which shall exist for all purposes human and divine. True, it will endure only so long as the temporal order exists, and die out when the temporal state is subverted or falls into decay, but in the meantime it will tower to heaven though it rests on the clay. This miserable conception of a church and of all things spiritual was realized in the sixteenth century, and has in its stronghold all but run its race. It will perish, as Cardinal Manning has beautifully said, by "that law of mortality which consumes all earthly things." It was not simply a bringing in the bondwoman to be mistress of the household, but it was a turning out the lawful consort to starve and die on the highway. It was such a monstrous treason to divine government as the world had never seen. The ignorant pagan rejected and persecuted the Catholic religion; but it was reserved for those professedly of the faith, and trained in the belief of a Divine Guide to throw off their allegiance to constituted authority and voluntarily exchange the yoke of Christ for the yoke of man. And so these sons of confusion speaking theretofore one tongue and one speech were scattered abroad, each speaking a language of his own—each at variance with the other and all with their former selves.

This experiment of combining the spiritual and temporal order, wherein the temporal was the acknowledged master, as history shows, has failed; and, as reason might have predicted, could not help failing. It was mighty in design, and promised all things in a legal and constitutional way. When the moral rule was acceptable to the State, and fitted it like the rare guest in the Procrustean bed, well and good; but if too long or too short it was lopped off or stretched to meet the required standard. And so morality

and spiritual matters were enacted, and amended, and repealed, along with the Game laws and the Civil Service regulations, and men were legal Christians and justified by Act of Parliament. The spectacle of the civil power, the temporal State establishing a Department of State for the spiritual guidance of a people, was, in view of the awful seriousness of the undertaking, apart from the arrogant assumption, enough to make the angels in heaven stand aghast.

Take the example of the Falck laws in Germany. Mr. Frederick Harrison, in the *Fortnightly Review*, discussed the practical effect of these laws: "First they require, as the condition of fulfilling any function in the Christian community, that the priest or minister should submit to a specified system of State education, and should have three years of theological training under a State professor. Next they require the sanction of the government to the appointment or the transfer of a cleric to any sacred duty, great or small, in every Christian community. Then they place the direction of the education in every clerical training-school in the kingdom in the hands of the minister of State, and make illegal any new religious seminary of whatever sect and however supported, including boarding-schools for young persons. These, then, are the main provisions. That is to say, the State undertakes the theological training of every kind of Christian cleric, Protestant or Catholic. It regulates the appointment of every kind of clerical duty, Protestant or Catholic, and it suppresses every theological education other than its own."

It is not necessary to particularize what ordinances a State may make in regard to religion; in discipline, in doctrine, in dogma, it is enough to see that it assumed to have all power in heaven and on earth. It was a mere question of lay votes in the House, not so much whether there should be sacraments or sacrifice, kneeling or bowing, but whether there should be altar, creed, or any visible form of worship whatever.

When the human, temporal, shadowy, and perishable power of man sets aside the Divine Guide and offers himself as a substitute, promising legal salvation, one is apt to think of the lying, boastful promises of the Tempter when he said to the Guide Himself: "All these things I will give thee if falling down thou wilt adore me." And so the State promised much to those who fell down and adored it, and they fell down and adored. More than that; rising they got possessions and lands and everything that the State could give, and these they kept, and will keep them always. To have a legal right to the things of this world is the religion and highest morality of the State. Its Kingdom is of this world.

The usurpation of the State in the case of a Church Establishment—a phrase as humiliating and significant as if one would say the Post-Office Establishment or the Army and Navy Establishment—is one that, when complete, effectually disposes of public worship and of all things spiritual. One well-worded Statute of Conformity makes short work of Dissenters and their churches and creeds. State churches, however, are going out of fashion, and it is not usurpations of this sort one must now expect, but encroachments more or less harmless in appearance, but in reality, and in the long run, totally subversive of religion.

The modern State having seen the failure of an Establishment in religion has gone to the other extreme. It will have nothing now to do with God or religion. There remains, however, some remnant of the spirit of old days when the civil arm helped the spiritual one to preserve decent respect towards the Creator of all things. There is a legend, preserved among other legal fictions, that Christianity is part of the law of the land. Well, to some extent it is part of the law of the land, but to what extent more than fifty other things which are part of the law of the land? It is, no doubt, contrary to law to speak or write or publish any profane words villifying or ridiculing God, Jesus Christ, the Old or the New Testament, or Christianity in general, with an intent to shock or insult believers, or to pervert or mislead the ignorant and unwary.¹ This is Blasphemy as legally defined, and renders the guilty person liable to fine or imprisonment, according to the discretion of the Court. The intent is the material point; consequently, we may villify and ridicule God and everything sacred, and yet the law of the land will take no notice thereof unless the jury find there was the intention of shocking or insulting believers or perverting or misleading the ignorant and unwary. Thus a man may "soberly and reverently" examine and question the truths of those doctrines essential to the Christian faith, no matter how fundamental, without offending the law.² No opinion, however heretical, no sarcasm or ridicule to the verge of profane scoffing or irreverent levity, can be held to be legal blasphemy and within the reach of the civil law. "The common law of England . . ." says Lord Mansfield, "knows of no persecution for mere opinions." "I apprehend," says Mr. Justice Coleridge, "that there is nothing unlawful at common law in reverently denying doctrines, parcel of Christianity, however fundamental." To those who are familiar with the ordinary civil law of libel and slander, there is nothing here that the State does for God and Christianity that it does not

¹ See Odgers *On Libel*, 2d ed., page 332.

² Mr. Justice Erskine in *Shore & Wilson*, Cl. & F. (House of Lords), 524, 5.

do every day for any citizen or subject, or any of the institutions, recognized by the law of the land. The secular Courts interfered to punish blasphemous libels for the same reason as they did in the case of any other libel, viz., in order to prevent a disturbance of the peace.¹

If the State stopped at this point it would be somewhat a justification of the phrase that it regards Christianity as part of the law of the land and further that it will see that God, the Three Persons of the Blessed and Undivided Trinity, are duly respected and that the Scriptures are not burnt contemptuously and irreverently.² This puts all these sacred persons and subjects on an exact level, before the law, with mankind and its institutions. But the State has not stopped at this point. Unitarianism for example, is not and never was blasphemous before the law, and the law will uphold a bequest "towards the support of Unitarians."³ These and other bequests that have been upheld for this monstrous heresy may not so obviously "strike at the root of Christianity," as Lord Raymond said in *Rex v. Woolston*,"⁴ but what about trusts and bequests for the spread of the Jewish religion? One would suppose that to help the Jewish religion would be scarcely a recognized principle in a commonwealth where Christianity is part of its law. Lord Hardwicke, it is true, in the year 1754 decided⁵ that a bequest of twelve hundred pounds to found "an assembly for reading the law and instructing people in our holy religion" (the Jewish) was void as being in "contradiction to the Christian religion which is part of the law of the land." Now however the case is different. By a Victorian statute⁶ Jews are now placed on the same footing as Protestant dissenters, and all bequests to promote the propagation of Judaism are valid. And long before this statute, by a case decided in 1813, trusts and legacies in favor of Jewish synagogues were held to be valid.⁷ The spirit of Liberalism could not be fairly expected to do more than this, to legalize divisions in its own household.

The encroachments of the State are perhaps more baneful in process of time than its most daring usurpations. For it may not only take its property by delicate confiscation but it may debauch the household and at last may gradually wean and then carry off

¹ Odgers *On Libel*, 2d ed., page 340.

² Father Petcherini was indicted in Ireland in 1855 for having contemptuously, irreverently and blasphemously burnt a Bible in public and with intent to bring the same into disregard, etc., etc. After a one sided charge by Baron Green the monk was acquitted. See 7 Cox, C. C., 79.

³ *Re Barnett*, 29 L. J. Chy., 871.

⁴ 2 Str., 834.

⁵ *Da Costa v. De Pas*, Ambler 228.

⁶ 9 and 10 Vic., cap. 59 (1846).

⁷ *Lazarus v. Simmonds*, 3 Mer., 393.

all its inmates. And all this may be done so plausibly, so patriotically, that we may be reprehended and abused for not being charmed with the process.

The modern State, with the benefit of some experience in bolder methods, says in effect: We will have nothing to do with religion, the name of God shall not appear in our constitutions, we shall prohibit the recognition of any form of worship; we will banish the crucifix from our courts of law and the mention of salvation from our systems of instruction; we will give freedom to every one in the churches but let us have the training, the education of the country. Give us the Child. The world is wise in its methods—the child of to-day is the man of the next generation. And so a State system of education is legalized and the next step is to make it compulsory. That is the tendency of the present age and it is nothing more or less than the most dangerous attack that has ever been made on the very existence of Christianity. It is worse than an Establishment, it is worse than a Persecution. It is such an abridgment of parental and spiritual rights as will lead to the most disastrous results. The old writers on law would have held up their hands in horror at this invasion of the natural rights of man. The Church always taking the ground that intellectual training should go hand in hand with moral and religious instruction, sees the State taking under its control what it deemed as the sum of all education and either neglecting or repressing or perverting the larger half of it. Yet when the State is through with its so-called education when and how can the foundation of all education be laid? How can you prop up the foundation while the gingerbread ornamentation is glittering on the roof? It would be, perhaps, better for a Christian father that his child should have been trained in a school of what he deemed the deadliest errors of religion and morality than that he should be brought up in an atmosphere in which religion and morality were legally excluded. There from necessity a false religion and false morality would have taken its place. One can attack and correct the errors of a known system, but how can one be certain he has ever reached the influences of a thousand indefinite impressions? One cannot attack an unknown quantity as well as one can a positive, tangible, and determinate system. When once a State is determined that the education of its children is its duty and the duty neither of Church nor of parent, you can count, humanly speaking, on the next generation being as far from the Church and with as little of the belief of its members as human laws and worldly associations can make it. The great danger of this present day is the loss of the child. Could this be actualized now all would be lost.

“The education of children in a manner suitable to their station

and calling," says Chancellor Kent, "is another branch of parental duty, of imperfect obligation generally in the eye of the municipal law, but of very great importance to the welfare of the State. A parent who sends his son into the world uneducated and without any skill in any art or science does a great injury to mankind as well as to his own family, for he defrauds the community of a useful citizen and bequeaths to it a nuisance. This parental duty is strongly, persuasively inculcated by the writers on natural law. Solon was so deeply impressed with the force of the obligation that he even excused the children of Athens from maintaining their parents if they had neglected to train them up in some art or profession." The learned jurist goes on to show how several of the nations of antiquity were so impressed with the duty that they feared to entrust it to the parent. This however was "upon the principle totally inadmissible in the modern civilized world of the absorption of the individual in the body politic and of his entire subjection to the despotism of the State." It is this despotism that we complain of.

The rights of the parents result from these duties. They are bound to maintain and educate their children and the State cannot rightfully interfere to deprive parents of this sacred trust unless for good and sufficient cause. The interference of the State is not to be dreaded in particular instances where the law rightfully steps in and deprives the parents of the custody of the child. These are not grievances but good, wholesome remedies. The real grievance is where the State sets up its own idol of education and insists upon all bowing down before it. That is an infringement on parental rights that cannot be defended. It is a blow at human liberty—at the liberty of the person.

If the morality of national or State education is to be judged by a defective system, at what depths may we suppose it to be where the leaders and types of that system are themselves devoid of Christian feeling? In England a few years ago there was an inspector of national schools who had a world wide reputation. His name was Matthew Arnold—the so-called apostle of "sweetness and light." Yet Mr. Arnold scoffed at the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity in language too brutal for repetition: he denied the divinity of Christ and ridiculed the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. He did all this in open day, and yet was a model school inspector for Christian England all the while. He acted in a manner that certainly rendered him amenable to the civil law for blasphemous libel.¹ After this *quis custodiet custodes?*

Again, the State, if unable to reach the child, may try its influ-

¹ See his *Literature and Dogma* and the shocking comparison of the three Lord Shaftesburys.

ence on the family. It has attacked the sanctity of marriage and has disputed the position of parents as the guardians of their children. Once the foundation of society in the family is endangered, a whole train of evils may be expected. Yet the civil law, by improperly unloosing what Heaven has joined together, strikes a serious blow at the Divine law. Marriage, with it, is a civil contract, to be dissolved or annulled on grounds more or less trivial, but always with regard to the parties interested, and not with reference to the inherent indissolubility of the relation in which they have voluntarily placed themselves. If the home is to have any sanctity, it must be preserved with a higher sense of morality than prevails in the partnership of a business-house or the by-laws of a joint-stock company. The family was the foundation of ancient society, even in pagan times; but modern theories not only disregard the family, but disintegrate it. This is a dangerous encroachment, and one that is subversive of a species of morality most essential to the well being of any State. The history of Rome affords a sample of woman at one time degraded from her lofty position as mother and mistress of her family, and at another time forced up out of her proper sphere in the opposite direction during the effeminacy of the later Cæsars. The Church alone assigns her her true place, and its Founder ennobled marriage and elevated it to the dignity of a Sacrament. The civil purpose of the modern State is to weaken and destroy the marriage tie, and to allow the contracting parties to contract other unions to the confusion of their own offspring and the scandal of society.

And so, in various ways, the State goes on, little by little, eating into the Divine law, and by mere human regulations adapting itself to the fallen and depraved natures of its subjects. The Church as an organization, the family, the children, the rights of parents and guardians, become at length matters of civil law, until there is no law beyond it. It does more than all this—it seeks to withdraw the firm ground from beneath the Church and leave it nothing to rest upon. With this object it attacks the Church's rights to property, and enacts what it calls Mortmain laws. No land, or money to be invested in land, or mortgage securities, or any of those species of property called chattels real, can be left by will, and sometimes not by deed, *inter vivos*, to religious bodies or for religious purposes. Not a farthing's worth of these, out of the wealth of a millionaire, in some countries styled Christian, can be devised or conveyed, to have one Mass said for the repose of his soul, much less to build or help to build a church for the most struggling parish in the land. The law favors everything of earth and nothing of heaven. What an extraordinary thing it is, that in a country where Christianity is said to be part of the law of the

land—as in England, for instance—you will find a score of statutes repressing in every way the devoting of one solid acre of land to perpetuate the name and religion of the Founder of Christianity, or purchasing a few feet of earth for the burial of one of God's poor. Such is the fact, however, and such is and has been the policy of the law, even when England was not of the religion it is to-day. The State, as it fights for the things of the world, is the same State, whether in the time of Richard II. or George II., whether in England or in France. Truly, its kingdom is not only of this world but it begrudges and restrains any gift or disposition that looks beyond it.

The State, however, is not without its arguments against the foregoing, and it has a morality of its own to offer. The Sunday must be decorously observed, though not with the strictness of a Scotch Sabbath, nor with the exactness of the Blue laws of New England. A day of rest is a human necessity, and any Divine Ordinance is well as a corroboration, but not essential to the validity of the statutes. Men and animals require rest, and it was a habit of even pagan nations. And so the moral precept can be followed where good reasons exists, apart from the precept. Sunday must, therefore, be decently devoted to rest or idleness—or rather to ceasing from labor. But there the ordinance ends, and there is nothing spiritual in it, no more than in the “three days of grace” on a promissory note. There is no morality about it, and there could be none no matter what was intended.

The State, however, recognizes God in its courts of justice. This, when inquired into, has no great depth. Perjury is a crime when any one is injured pecuniarily, but as a sin simply, perjury is of no consequence from a legal point of view. To be a crime, perjury must be a wilful false swearing in any judicial proceeding. Then, the matter of the oath must be material to the issue or point in question, and the oath must be a lawful one, administered by some person of competent authority. When you come to regard all these, the moral complexion of perjury is lost sight of altogether—it is the highest contempt of the civil court, and the law must take care of its own self-respect and that of my lord the judge.

Again, blasphemy and sacrileges are punishable—the former when it disturbs the peace or is occasion of scandal to decency; the latter, when there is injury done to the material church. Of common swearing, lewdness, immorality, and all the species of offences known to the criminal law up to murder and treason, the safety of the citizen, as the Roman law has it, was the supreme law; the sin was not only not punished, but not taken into account. Therein the State was right—the sins that do not concern persons or property do not come within its jurisdiction. Admittedly, there-

fore, if mankind is to be governed by law, the civil law can only take its own share of rights and wrongs—the remainder of the list must be decided by some other law. So far as there is a visible outward authority for that purpose, it must be the Church. The Divine command is no less to render to God the things that are God's than to render to Cæsar his due.

These are a few of the encroachments of pagan Cæsar, but there are others, and the general design is to make his rule complete.

"The State," says Fr. Parkinson, "makes war on the practice of the Evangelical counsels, . . . it proscribes religious orders, and sets the brand of exile on its members. The State tears the priest from the sanctuary, and forces him to bear arms in wars, just or unjust, as it lays hands on the student in the seminary and educates him as a soldier, though God calls him to the altar. The State takes the child from the parent and the pastor, and educates him in its own schools in a mixed religion of its own; it even enters once more into the seminary, prescribes what the future priest shall learn, what books he shall study, and makes itself the final judge as to his fitness to enter upon the sacred ministry; and then, it supervises his doctrine and preaching; and takes into its own hands the control of his relations to his bishop, of the conditions of his communications with the chief Pastor of all the faithful. . . . But surely, these are enough to describe the system, which is the Anti-Christian system of relations between Church and State, which is the result of the working of the same domineering and impious spirit which carried the Roman ensigns into the Holy Place, and which shall have the fullest manifestation which God will ever permit when Antichrist shall seat himself in the Temple of God, showing himself as if he were God."¹

¹ The *Month*, December, 1874. See, also, article in *Dublin Review*, commenting on this,

THE BATTLE OF THE BOYNE AND THE SIEGES OF
LIMERICK, 1690-1691.

I.

THE first great battle between the Jacobites and the Williamites occurred July 1, O. S., 1690. The writer stood on the historic spot 200 years after that strangest of battles between sire and son, had driven the one forever from Ireland, and almost secured to the other the crown he had coveted since the day of his marriage with his uncle's heiress. The astute and ambitious prince married his cousin for her expectations, not for affection. Many years elapsed before any love appeared on either side. His eye was always fixed on the throne which would be hers if her fair Italian step-mother bore no son. And should it come to her, it would be his, for, as he elegantly said, later: "He would not be his wife's subject, nor would he be tied to her apron-strings." From the hour of his marriage, he did all he could to create or foment discontent in England: and shortly after the birth of his wife's brother, he came over as the "Deliverer."

The Boyne which laves the southern frontier of Louth, the smallest county in Ireland, and forms part of the northern boundary of Meath, one of the largest, rises out of a holy well in Kildare, and is named after St. Boyne. Within four miles of its mouth, is the ancient town of Drogheda, situated in two counties and two dioceses. From its heights, or from the splendid viaduct that spans the river, may be seen the famous field on which William III. was victor and James II. vanquished. From the town to "King William's Glen," north of the river, or to "King James' Hill," south, is about a mile. You can go by the south side, cross the bridge at "the field," and return by the Rampart on Meath side; there is no mistaking the fatal field. It is marked by a massive obelisk, 150 feet high, on a huge irregular granite boulder, some 20 feet square. The date is in the Old Style. Other nations were ten days later. Rather than "quarrel with the stars," they followed the Gregorian, or New Style. Obelisks are not common in Ireland. An ugly one marks the spot on which George IV., the next king who visited Ireland after William III., landed at Dunleavy, now Kingstown. On the rocky base of the Egyptian landmark that overshadows the Boyne is the following pretty inscription.

"Sacred to the memory of King William III. who, on July 1,

1690, passed the river near this place to attack James II. at the head of a Popish army advantageously posted on the south side of it, and did, on that day, by a single battle, secure to us and to our posterity, our liberty, laws, and religion. In consequence of this action, James left the kingdom and fled to France."

"This memorial of our deliverance was erected in the ninth year of the reign of George II., the first stone being laid by Lionel Sackville, Lord Lieutenant of the kingdom of Ireland, 1736."

The people of Drogheda, a most Catholic place, have always before their eyes this remarkable pillar, which says that this battle secured to their country her liberty, laws and religion—the contrary being the case. Even to the Williamites in Ireland, nothing was *secured* till the honorable capitulation of Limerick. Nor were the liberties and religion of the people restored to them, even partially till over a century later. And the laws were made so unjust, cruel, and repressive of everything the people gloried in, that it has been said, and not entirely untruly, that the ordinary idea of patriotism with the Irish peasant was: "To be again the law."

II.

Two roads lead out of Drogheda to the battle-field. The ground towards the fatal spot is varied by low green hills. Suddenly your horse makes a quick turn, and, behold, you are in the beautiful valley of the Boyne. Within a few yards of the obelisk, the river is spanned by a handsome iron and stone bridge, with latticed iron sides, painted white. Heavy piers of limestone support it. Visitors sometimes record their sentiments on the dead white of the parapets. Every available spot was covered with pencil scribbling, when we saw it. Some sentences were patriotic, others affectionate. Strange, there was not a line complimentary to the "glorious, pious, and immortal memory" of the peevish manikin whose name is inseparably connected with the sweeping river.

From the bridge are seen some fine country residences. Old Bridge House in the midst of smiling meadows that slope to the water's edge, is a charming and stately home. A rising ground, thickly wooded, leads to Donore Hill in the waving plains of fertile Meath.¹ From this height James viewed the contest he shared only vicariously. The spot on which the timorous, irresolute prince stood, in an ancient churchyard sanctified by a ruined church, is marked by a group of ash trees. Further off is Duleek, whither a part of his army retreated after the fight. On the ancient bridge, built 1587, some of his cannon were placed.

¹ It is said that one acre in Meath is worth two acres elsewhere, because of the great fertility of the soil.

III.

James landed at Kinsale, March 12, 1689. The house in which he rested, now an apothecary's shop, has little to distinguish it from its fellows, save some ancient stucco work. In Cork, he slept at the Dominican Priory, Crosses' Green, whose site is now occupied by a handsome Convent of Mercy, St. Marie's of the Isle. The Mayor of Cork, 1688, was Patrick Roche; the Sheriffs, Messrs. French and Morough. The Mayor, 1689, was Dominick Sarsfield; the Sheriffs, Messrs. Mead and Nagle. James heard Mass at the Franciscan Church, North Side, of which no vestige now remains. He was supported through the streets by two Franciscan Friars, and followed by several members of the same Order, in their brown habits. His host was the Earl of Clancarty; he created Tyrconnel, who met him in Cork, a duke, and thus Frances Jennings became a duchess long before her sister, Sarah of Marlborough. James was the first sovereign who visited Ireland since the Plantagenet epoch. Everywhere he was received with open arms; his early reputation for bravery made his supporters hope they had a king equal to the emergency that had arisen. On Palm Sunday, March 24th, he made his triumphal entry into Dublin. As he rode through the streets multitudes cheered him on every side; arras and tapestry hung from the windows of the rich,—the poor draped theirs with blankets. The season being ten days later than the date, O. S., vegetation was advanced, and green boughs and flowers added to the decorations. A solemn *Te Deum* was sung in Christ Church, in thanksgiving for the king's arrival.¹ His Majesty issued a proclamation convoking a Parliament for May 7th.

It has been acutely said that James II. was a Catholic in religion and a Protestant in politics. His chief enemies were the descendants of those English and Scotch fanatics for whom his grandfather had stolen thousands of acres in Ulster, and the Cromwellian settlers, whose chief also had robbed the Irish to enrich their enemies. For the latter spoliation, the "merry monarch" made scarcely any reparation, preferring to act on Clarendon's infamous policy: Humor your enemies; you are always sure of your friends. Everything James could do to lessen his chances of success, which were good, he did. He went to Derry to protect his Protestant subjects, who were tolerably well able to take care of themselves and had powerful allies. His General, Hamilton, had almost succeeded in taking the city, but James thought his conditions too easy. Had this unlucky king remained in

¹ King James, while in Dublin, attended Mass in Christ Church. The Lord Deputies, or Viceroy, and the Lord Mayor of Dublin used to be sworn into office in Christ Church.

France and commissioned others to fight his battles, history would have a different tale to tell of the Jacobite wars in Ireland. The only ill treatment meted out to him on Irish soil was bestowed in sight of Derry; he was refused admittance within its gates, and, to add injury to insult, one of his contumacious subjects fired on his sacred person. He returned to Dublin to meet his Parliament, in which to the evident disgust of Macaulay, the *O's* and *Mac's* predominated. It was mainly a Catholic assembly, natural enough in a Catholic country, though this, too, failed to find favor with the Whig historian, or rather, romancist. Parliament was held in an old Dominican Priory occupying the site from which now arise the massive Four Courts. James appeared on a throne in the House of Lords in royal robes, wearing a crown.¹ He thanked the Irish for remaining true to him when his other kingdoms had deserted his cause. It was the last Parliament he opened, and though its proceedings may not have been acceptable at Westminster, for which the Lords and Commons of Ireland were not legislating, yet some wise and honest measures were passed. Men who for a century and a half had been persecuted for their religion established full liberty of conscience for all, and they repealed the Act of Settlement, by which Cromwell had legalized the robbery of the lawful proprietors of their estates. "Though papists," says Grattan, "they were not slaves; they wrung a Constitution from James before they accompanied him to the field."

Ireland had been nearly wiped out of existence by Cromwell. Goldwin Smith says, "The descendants of the Cromwellian land-owners became probably the very worst upper class with which a country was ever afflicted." The real owners were wandering about in misery, or had sought refuge in foreign lands; the Restoration brought no relief. "This country has been perpetually rent and torn since His Majesty's return," said Lord Deputy, Essex. "Men beaten with whips in Cromwell's time cry out they are now beaten with scorpions," wrote Bishop French, of Ferns. Since the accession of James, however, Ireland had enjoyed peace, and showed extraordinary recuperative power. To aid their King, the nobility equipped many military companies at their own expense; the country had been drained of its men by transportation and incessant warfare, but "there was life in the old land yet," and had it been possible to save the Stuart King from himself, and put a great soldier like Owen Roe O'Neill of an earlier

¹ James put a Catholic Irishman, Richard Talbot, Earl of Tyrconnel, at the head of affairs in Ireland; this was one of his best appointments. Unhappily, future Viceroy were not so well selected with a view to the happiness of the people over whom they were placed. Queen Victoria and her advisers have not yet imitated the liberality, or rather justice, of the much maligned James II.

era, or Patrick Sarsfield, who represented Dublin in James' Parliament, over the régiments hurriedly raised by McMahon, O'Reilly, Maguire, Nugent and others, and let James do what his successors have generally done since, keep far from war's alarms, Ireland might have been saved to the Stuarts. In justice to James, it must be admitted he was not fighting on his own element; the qualifications of England's greatest admiral would not necessarily make a general successful on land service; sailors fighting on land do little better than soldiers in a naval engagement.

IV.

William III. landed at Carrickfergus, under the walls of the castle, June 14, 1690. The stone on which he first set foot is still pointed out; from that memorial to the Boyne we have followed his trail. Between Newry and Dundalk two or three hundred of his men were routed by the Jacobites. Several skirmishes during the spring had resulted mostly in the discomfiture of the invaders. More than half of William's men were foreigners; he distrusted the English¹ and found a reaction in favor of his uncle. Prince George of Denmark and other high personages he kept near him rather as hostages than aids. His well drilled strangers, representing nearly every European nationality, were not chivalrous warriors; their princes were wont to hire them out to the highest bidder. The whole invading force, including raw recruits from England, has been variously estimated at from forty to fifty-two thousand, double the number of the opposing army. Three provinces and part of Ulster kept their fealty to their old king. William was fighting on his own element; he never risked himself in a sea fight, yet he scarcely ever won a battle. Personal bravery he showed, and, however unfortunate in the field, he loved fighting, and was more at home in the carnage of battle than in his palaces. Though he was part of the dual head of the Protestant Church (1688-1694), and posed as a Protestant hero, he was a Dutch Calvinist by profession, and hated the English Establishment. His behavior in church scandalized many, even among his friends; he carried his irreverence so far as to keep his hat on during Divine service. He probably cared little about any religion; ambition and intense devotion to his worldly interest held religion's place in his soul. A great part of his life he spent as hired generalissimo of the ultra Catholic power, Spain.

¹ William thoroughly despised the English, and treated England somewhat like a conquered province. One of his medals bore a shattered oak and a blooming orange tree, with the legend: "Instead of acorns golden oranges." Burnet's inaugural pastoral declared that William and Mary reigned by right of conquest. Bently published a book entitled *William and Mary, Conquerors*. These productions gave great offence; Parliament sentenced them to be burnt by the common hangman.

William was a man of mean presence, considerably below medium height. At the Revolution, his pictures represented him as a giant—a piece of flattery not without influence on his cause. His name is a synonym for bloodshed and religious intolerance. His “pious, glorious and immortal” memory is revered by Orangemen, of whom he is patron saint. Should you travel in northern Ireland toward the great anniversary, you will see that the cottagers take special care of the orange lilies that set their gardens aflame—they must be ready for “the wulk” on the 12th. On that great day, what commotion! gorgeous flags and fiery streamers, purple banners fringed with orange or gold—poor Catholics bar their doors, the Orangers are out. The men wear orange sashes, the women ribbons of the same bright color, edged with blue. High above the crowd is borne a portrait of “the Oranger,” of greatly magnified proportions—there would be nothing imposing in a genuine likeness—on a white charger crossing the Boyne. The procession moves on; the horses are bedecked with orange flowers and streamers. It passes under arches of evergreens and orange lilies. On the other side of the Atlantic and below the Indian Ocean, the same has been seen. The eyes are regaled on these festive occasions, but the ears are not neglected. Band after band strike up Orange music. Cheers for the small hero of Nassau are commingled with groans and execrations for his hapless father-in-law. No Jacobite now lives to squeeze oranges at the wily stadtholder, or shout “Confusion to his hooked nose,” but the moving panorama rarely scatters without bloodshed.

Miss Strickland styles the foreign mercenaries of William, “the wickedest and cruelest troops England had ever seen;” by this it seems they surpassed the bloody hordes of Cromwell. Schomberg’s chaplain, Dr. Gorge, describes them as profligate, licentious and wallowing in crimes too odious to mention. While in the marshy neighborhood of Dundalk, many of them were sick in the sand dunes. James might have annihilated his enemies with the help of the pestilence that was decimating them, but he could not be persuaded to attack the troops of “his son.” This provoked Marshal Rosen¹ beyond endurance, and he exclaimed, in a burst of indignation: “Sire, if you had a hundred kingdoms, you would lose them all.”

V.

The troops of James retreated to the Meath side of the Boyne, near Drogheda, from whose gate-towers floated his royal standard

¹ Lord Wharton boasted that he had sung James II. out of Ireland by a song called *Liliburlero*. This vile doggerel had a bold, catching air, which was sung everywhere and whistled in the hearing of James himself.

and the Flag of the Lilies. William had been only two weeks in Ireland, but had worked energetically from the moment of his landing. Still in the prime of life, in his 40th year, he was everywhere, attending to everything. James was prematurely old for 57. William's marauders poured down "King William's Glen," and posed as "an army in battle array." From Doure Hill, James, surrounded by some French allies, viewed the unequal contest. "With admirable courage," says James, Duke of Berwick, "the Irish troops charged the English *ten times* after they had crossed the river." But James II. had no praise for these "very great scorers of death." "If love begets love, the English should certainly love James II. He would scarcely have been pleased had he vanquished them. He would hardly have liked to see his English defeated. They had persecuted him almost from his birth. The Irish had shed torrents of blood for him and his, and were still, at terrible odds, fighting his battles. Yet he had no pity for them. When he saw them bearing rather heavily on his countrymen, he cried out, to the unspeakable disgust of his soldiers: "Spare, oh spare! my English subjects!"

Over a thousand Irish corpses lay stark upon the bloody field as the shades of evening fell on that bright July day. The enemy deplored 500 killed, among them Schomberg,¹ and many wounded. The defeat was due to the miserable King. The vanquished, though they had fought seven hours under a burning sun, were willing to continue the battle if they could get rid of their unlucky leader. "Change Kings and we will fight it over again," was their pathetic cry.

The domestic miseries of this British Lear, added to the premature old age sometimes seen in persons who begin life too early, and the injury done him physically by severe attacks of sanguineous apoplexy, may have partially unbalanced the royal mind; the action of James after his expulsion, was often the action of a maniac. On this fatal day, he fled before the battle was over, gained Dublin in an incredibly short time, and with base ingratitude (if he were in his senses) charged the Irish with

¹ William showed great grief for Schomberg and a funeral at Westminster was spoken of, but no further notice was taken by him of the death of "the first captain in Europe." The dean and chapter of St. Patrick's, Dublin, where his ashes lie, vainly urged his relations to contribute towards a monument. A memorial was at length put up by the church dignitaries. The inscription by Dean Swift, says, that Duke Schomberg's reputation for valor availed more with strangers than ties of blood did with his own kindred. Walker, Bishop of Derry, fared worse. When the King heard he was shot at the ford, he gruffly asked: "Why did the fool go there?" Yet to this fighting parson he owed Derry, and perhaps Ireland. From the effigy of Walker, on top of the Walker monument, Derry, the sword is reported to have fallen the day the Emancipation Act received the royal signature.

cowardice. "The Irish, Madame, can run very fast," said the royal fugitive to Lady Tyrconnel, who came down the castle stair-case to meet him. "In this," she retorted, "your Majesty surpasses them for you have won the race." It was the first battle ever James lost. He embarked for France at Waterford, leaving his faithful Irish to continue the war.¹

When "Mary, the Daughter," heard of her husband's success, she wrote him a letter with the following passage, showing that, though she had violated the fourth commandment, she had some zeal for her own religion: "I have desired to beg that you be not too quick in parting with the confiscated estates, but consider whether you will not keep some for public schools to instruct the poor Irish. I must need say I think you would do very well if you would consider what care can be taken of the poor souls there; and, indeed, if you give me leave, I must tell you the wonderful deliverance and success you have had should oblige you to think upon doing what you can for the advancement of the true religion and promoting the gospel."

William never made the slightest reparation for the atrocities he inflicted on Ireland. The estates referred to he gave to the infamous Elizabeth Villiers, who had, even in the honeymoon of the Orange nuptials, supplanted the beautiful Mary in his affections. The Irish would not have accepted such "true religion" as "the daughter" proposed to give." But, strange to say, 15 years after Mary's death, "the Villiers" who had meanwhile become Countess of Orkney, founded a school in Middletown, Cork (1709) for the education of the poor children in the Protestant religion, and endowed it with some of the above estates. They had been leased by King James at £200 a year to Sir Richard Mead and William North, Esq., being part of his private fortune, inherited from the Earls of Clare and Ulster. The magnanimous William and Mary seized this property as they did the very furniture and clothing of their desolate father and his saintly queen.

VI.

Ireland had been "brayed in a mortar." There were people living, in a country always famous for the number attaining longevity, who remembered the terrible bloodshed and planting of James I, the stand made for his son when driven out by the English, and sold for a groat by the Scotch, and the Cromwellian massacre of 40 years previous. In the tragic and pathetic story of the century there was little to remember but wars and rumors

¹ O'Halloran, almost a contemporary, says that it was by means of a barter trade with France in which the Irish gave their wool, hides, tallow and butter, for powder, ball and arms that the war was so long maintained against William.

of wars, and the perpetual warfare the people waged for religion and liberty. Of the space between 1641 and 1652, Sir William Petty says: "If Ireland had continued in peace for said 11 years, the 1,466,000 (pop. in 1641) had increased by generations in that time to 73,000, making in all 1,529,000, which were brought by wars, 1652, to 850,000, so that 689,000 souls were lost, for whose blood somebody must answer to God and the King.

The recuperative powers of Ireland were literally enormous. In an account of Rinuccini's¹ sojourn in Ireland, 1645—1649, preserved in the archives of the Irish College in Rome, the writer says: "Families are very large. Some have as many as 30 children, all living, and the number of those who have from 15 to 20 is immense. All these children are handsome, tall and robust. The same unimpeachable authority mentions the extraordinary beauty of the women, their elegant manners, the superb entertainments given, the comeliness and strength of the men, the cheerfulness with which they bore every species of hardship. The description given in the Rinuccini papers of the fish, flesh, Spanish and French wines, excellent milk and butter, apples, pears, plums, and "all eatables" served to the Archbishop and his retinue,² is entirely at variance with Macaulay's word on the same subject. And both describe the state of things when the country was in her chronic condition—war. The papers mention with evident admiration, that the Irish, even in remote places, were thoroughly instructed in their religion, respectful to the clergy, and enthusiastically devoted to the Pope.

After the Boyne success, William III. repaired to Dublin, where he was cordially welcomed by the Protestants, now relieved from their agonizing fears that the Catholics might retaliate on them the cruelties they had remorselessly inflicted on the Catholics. Special thanksgiving was made for the victory which gave England a national debt and increased religious animosity a hundredfold.

¹ John Baptist Rinuccini, Archbishop of Fermo, was sent to Ireland as nuncio-extraordinary by Pope Innocent X., with a supply of arms and money.

² The diet, housing and clothes *is* much the same as in England; nor is French elegance unknown to many of them, nor the French and Latin tongues. *Political Anatomy of Ireland*—Sir William Petty. "What an answer to Lord Macaulay," is Maurice Lenihan's comment.

Mr. Lenihan quotes a curious letter of Captain Taylor, who sends to the camp near Limerick, Aug. 20, 1690, "all this poor country can afford, and all that is left worth his Majesty's eating . . ." "one veale, 10 fat wethers, 12 chickinges, 2 dussen of frest butter, 2 th ck cheese and a thin one, 10 loaves of bread, a dussen and a half of pidgeons; 12 bottles of ale, half a barrel of small ale, some kidnie beans." "We are strongly of opinion," comments Mr. Lenihan, "that no French *cuisinier* could provide a daintier feast for Royalty than did Captain Taylor, under the circumstances, provide for William III., while he lay before Limerick."

Sunday, July 6th, William rode in state to St. Patrick's Cathedral. The spot in the choir is still shown on which he stood, with his uncle's crown on his head, to give thanks for the success of his ambitious schemes. From that day the Cathedrals of Dublin, Christ Church and St. Patrick's, two of the most beautiful churches in Christendom, and rich beyond the power of words to describe in religious and historic associations, have been in possession of the alien church. Catholics within the memory of man were obliged to worship, in peril of their lives, in a new form of catacombs. Schomberg's tablet is in the chancel of St. Patrick's. Swift reposes not far off. Near him is Stella's last resting-place. What a cloud of witnesses arise from the grave and surround one in this venerable spot. Stella came from the household of Sir William Temple, friend of William III., and the King knew Swift and offered him a post in the army. But what are the historical to the religious associations of a temple sanctified by the presence of saints? The French allies retreated westward, the Irish were gathering near the mouth of the Shannon. William turned his face towards Limerick, the Jacobite metropolis of Ireland. The eccentric little Lauzan, whose selection by James and his queen for a high post in their army was a wretched mistake, was eager to return to France with the remnants of the Red, Blue and White regiments, and they were easily spared. If Macaulay's accounts of them be true, they were some of the poorest warriors that ever cumbered Irish ground.

VII.

Forty days after the battle of the Boyne, William appeared before Limerick, whose walls, Lauzan said, could be battered down with roasted apples. Limerick was a pretty town and made a fine appearance from the river. Some forty years previous, it had been the scene of many tragic and pathetic incidents when besieged by Cromwellian warriors under Ireton,¹ son-in-law of the ferocious Protector. Pestilence was scourging the city; 8000 died of the plague during the short siege of 1657. The heroic Bishop, Terence Albert O'Brien, lived among the stricken. Day and night he encouraged the people to be true to their God and their country. The besiegers offered him 43,000 gold crowns to leave the city, but he disdainfully rejected their treacherous advances. When the siege was raised, no quarter was allowed to

¹ Some sixty years before Ireton's attack, Spenser described "the most plentiful and populous country" of Munster as reduced to "a heap of ashes and carcasses" by the English soldiery. Later, the Puritans "swore to extirpate the whole Irish nation" (Clarendon). June 4, 1646, 5000 Irish under Owen Roe O'Neil defeated 8000 Puritans at Benburb. Napoleon said that, had this intrepid warrior lived, he would have proved a match for Cromwell.

priests or bishops, and a price was set on O'Brien's head. It was in the pest-house, ministering to the sick and dying, that the enemy found this brave prelate. Brought before Ireton, he was tried by court-martial and condemned to the horrible death of a traitor, in which the gibbet preceded the block and the quartering began before life was extinct. Undismayed by so dire a prospect, he upbraided Ireton for his cruelties, and, in stern words, which proved prophetic, summoned the unjust and sanguinary judge to meet him at the bar of eternal justice, to answer to God for his crimes. The noble head of the martyr was spiked on a tower in the middle of the bridge. The sacred spot on which he won his crown is proudly pointed out by his compatriots and revered by them with the piety characteristic of their race.

Eight days after this awfully dramatic scene, the dark and cruel Ireton was writhing in the agonies of the plague, which he had probably caught from the bishop's clothing. He raved wildly of the murdered prelate, and charged upon his council a crime committed by his own order. This fierce persecutor who had spilt the blood of the saints like water, enjoyed no peace after the awful summons of his victim. In tortures no remedy could assuage, he died in despair. In an ancient street in Limerick is Ireton's house, a large, gloomy mansion, wearing a weird, or, rather, condemned look; it is let out in tenements, and gradually falling into decay. His corpse, which would scarcely be allowed to rest in consecrated ground in Ireland, was buried in Westminster Abbey, but not suffered to remain there. After an heroic defence of six months, two thousand five hundred of the garrison laid down their arms in St. Mary's Cathedral. As they marched sadly out of that venerable edifice, many of them dropped dead of the plague!

William III. came before Limerick (1690) thinking the city would at once surrender. The soldiers relieved of the presence of their continental auxiliaries, guarded every post. William's 20,000 men encamped on the crest of the hills of Singland, a few hundred yards from the city walls. In the previous century, Limerick had been called the city of castles. Dinely, who made a tour of Ireland in the time of Charles II., mentions its houses as "tall, built of black or polished marble, with partitions five feet thick and battlements on the top." Whitmore Castle, called also Sarsfield's Castle, as tradition says the great general lived there during the sieges, was the Globe Tavern, and famed for its excellent claret. Ardent spirits were sold only in drug stores till William III. popularized their use legally and by example. The walls defending the Irish town were in better condition than those of the English town. William's friend, Herr Bentinck, and William himself with Herr Overkirke, and other officers, reconnoitred the premises.

The dash and spirit of the besiegers, the heroic resistance of the besieged, and the peculiar circumstances of a bombardment in which fair matrons and modest maidens took part, are recorded by the aggressors and the defenders. The ruthless savagery of William's heterogeneous warriors is a tradition among the descendants of those who suffered from it. Their chief occupation was hanging all the unfortunate Irishmen who came in their way, on pretence that they were Rapparees, but really because they were true to their creed and country.

Among the objects of interest that rose above the walls was St. Mary's Cathedral, from whose battlements floated the standard of King James. This beautiful edifice, with its soaring towers and romantic bells, was seized by the Protestants, June 15, 1655, when all papists were commanded to leave the city.¹ It was restored by James II. to the owners, who held it during the sieges, '90-'91. After the Treaty it was retaken by the Protestants. Founded by Donald O'Brien in the twelfth century, it has resisted the ravages of time and escaped the iconoclastic rage of more ruthless destroyers. The poor of Limerick indulge the hope that it will yet come back to the rightful owners.

This venerable temple, though abounding in objects of interest to the historian and antiquarian, has a dark and gloomy aspect. A visitor lately remarked this to a poor woman selling apples in the shadow of its massive spire. "Ah, then," she replied, "why shouldn't it be dark and heavy? Didn't Cromwell's wretches and William's Orangers turn out the Blessed Sacrament and quench the lamp? *Sure it couldn't be bright or lightsome without Him!*"

VIII.

Sarsfield's brilliant achievement, one of the grandest exploits of modern warfare, by which he led a chosen band out of Limerick and blew to atoms the siege-train of William, saved the city. The bravery of the besieged who flung back their assailants whenever they approached, extorted words of admiration from the phlegmatic prince who was too enthusiastic a soldier not to appreciate the extraordinary heroism of the defenders, women and men. The official list puts his loss at 500 killed and 1100 wounded, but more truthful authorities rate it much higher, even over 2000 killed. In the heaps of the slain were the uniforms of almost every country in Europe. The lateness of the season, constant rains, and other reasons are given for raising the siege. But it was raised because William was beaten, and for no other cause. The garrison, aided by the heroic women, forced him to withdraw. Sars-

¹ Cromwell's *State Papers*.

field's *coup* on the memorable night, August 11th–12th, contributed immensely to the discomfiture of his battalions. To his dismay he learned that the walls which the little knight errant, Lauzan, considered incapable of resisting roasted apples, stood firm against the scientific engineering of the most famous artillerists in the world. The maddened besiegers, in retaliation or revenge, hacked and butchered every native they met. William did not take his defeat philosophically. "Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown," was especially true of him the last night of the siege. He drank plentifully of the strong liquor he loved, but this, instead of restoring the little good humor he had, at his best, made him more morose and gloomy. "He cursed the fate that brought him to Limerick to witness a defeat unparalleled in the annals of warfare. None of his generals dare approach him. Tortured and maddened, he cast the blame on all about him, and as he weighed the advantages of the Boyne with the losses and disgrace of Limerick, he groaned in spirit.¹ A spirited ballad by Thomas Davis, on the Battle of Limerick, August 27, 1690, concludes :

"Out with a roar the Irish sprung,
And back the beaten English flung,
Till William fled, his lords among,
From the city of Luimneach lionnglas."²

'Twas thus was fought that glorious fight,
By Irishmen for Ireland's right—
May all such days have such a night
As the battle of Luimneach lionnglas."

William raised the siege, August 31st, and turning his back forever on the "city of the Azure river," embarked for England, September 5th, and reached Kensington, September 16th. No doubt he was consoled by his adoring consort whom he found in much better physical health than himself. After her return to England, Mary had grown enormously large.

William had lost his hold on "the country worth fighting for." Hundreds of regulars were dead in the trenches. Before starting for Waterford, he had left his well-drilled but vicious soldiers in command of his countrymen, Solmes and Ginckle.

IX.

Colonel Richard Grace repulsed the Williamites at Athlone. "When provisions fail," said he, "I'll eat my boots, but never surrender." On June 18, 1691, Ginckle came before that devoted town with 25,000 men, and began a second siege. Grace, a gray-headed veteran, was removed to a subordinate position, and his place given

¹ *Hist. Limerick*, Lenihan.

² Limerick of the Azure river.

to d'Usson. This was one of the numerous Jacobite blunders. Grace fell fighting at his post. Bad generalship caused most of the Jacobite disasters. However, prodigies of valor were performed by the besieged, and the enemy were retiring when, through a mistake of St. Ruth, Athlone was taken in a final assault. July 23, 1691, at Aughrim, was fought the greatest battle of the war. The enemy lost over 3000, the vanquished over 2000. The conqueror might have said with an ancient hero: "One such victory more and I am undone." The death of the impetuous St. Ruth¹ in the moment of triumph, caused the defeat. The reader will recall Moore's beautiful lines to the air of "The Lamentation of Aughrim," beginning:

"Forget not the field where they perished
The truest, the last of the brave,
All gone, and the bright hope we cherished
Gone with them, and quenched in their grave."

Aughrim is now a mere string of small houses, in a sweet pastoral country. The ruined castle from which the Stuart standard waved still frowns above it. The peasant will point out the field called in the Irish language: "The cry of the heart," where widows and orphans sought their loved husbands and fathers among the heaps of the slain. Hard by is "The Bridge of a Thousand Heads," in defending which, tradition says, a thousand Irish warriors fell; 7000 are said to have perished at Aughrim, before the standard of St. George was flung out from the castle. Ginckle now tried his fortune at Limerick. What remained of the armies that had charged at the Boyne, and resisted unto death at Athlone, and shed their blood in torrents under the shadow of the ancient castle of Aughrim came down to the Shannon to defend the beleaguered city. It was said that Limerick looked somewhat like a spider, whose narrow waist was Ball's Bridge. Portions of the old walls flanked by towers are still standing. As late as 1760, seventeen gates stood around Limerick, whose sites may still be traced. The ramparts defended by women stretched from St. John's Gate to Clare Street. Some of the walls thirty feet thick, were afterwards tunnelled. In the next century, they were metamorphosed into Roche's beautiful Hanging Gardens, the wonder and delight of the people. The quarries of Garryowen supplied material for the citadel, the castle walls and monuments; even the streets were paved with marble.²

For sixty days, the besieged under Sarsfield, resisted the picked

¹ St. Ruth showed his jealousy by ordering Sarsfield to the rear, and keeping him in ignorance of his plans. Yet in ability and capacity Sarsfield was infinitely superior to the other great soldiers of his time.

² Limerick has always been famous for flowers and gardens; *Garryowen* is a corruption of *Owen's Garden*.

guards and legions of Ginckle, and the history of the late siege repeated itself. As the foreign mercenaries approached, Richard Talbot, Duke of Tyrconnel and Lord Deputy for James II., was struck with apoplexy, August 11th. He died August 14th, and was buried in St. Mary's Cathedral the following night.¹ The house in which he expired was long pointed out; only its site, near St. Munchin's Church, can now be traced.

The most disastrous incident of the siege was the massacre of the courageous men who held Thomond Gate against the enemy; 850 men were driven across the bridge when the French major in command ordered the drawbridge to be raised, lest in a hand-to-hand fight, the grenadiers might enter the city. Into the river were pushed 150 men; 600 were cooped up on the narrow bridge, so closely wedged together that they were unable to defend themselves. The heaps of the slain rose higher than the parapets; over 600 perished of that gallant band that had for hours checked the advance of a whole army.

Want of food and ammunition made the defence of the city toward the close nearly impossible. The besiegers offered conditions with which no fault could be found; further resistance was useless, and on September 24th a three days' truce was begun. Sarsfield and the brave Scotchman, Wauchap, who ably seconded him, conferred with the Williamites, represented by their leaders. Near Thornam Bridge may be seen, raised by steps several feet from the ground, the large stone which tradition asserts was used as a table when the Treaty was signed, October 3, 1591, by which was closed the war between James II.² and "his son," William of Orange. The treaty was quickly violated,³ hence Limerick is styled "The City of the Violated Treaty."

Scarcely was this treaty signed when a French fleet of eighteen ships and twenty passports, with three thousand men, two hundred officers, ten thousand stand of arms, with plenty of clothing and provisions, appeared in the Shannon. Had this help come sooner, Sarsfield would not have accepted the favorable terms of the enemy; with this great force behind him he might have taken

¹ Tyrconnel, an Irish noble, and a staunch friend of James II., was the first Catholic made Lord Deputy of Ireland since the Reformation—and, we may add, the last.

² James has been blamed for coining brass money and gun money (*i. e.*, money made of old guns) also for raising the value of English and foreign gold and silver coin. He promised to redeem all at the expiration of the "present necessity." Though an able financier he did not think of issuing paper money, or creating a national debt, like his successors.

³ When Sarsfield marched out of Limerick, colors flying, drums beating, with all the honors of war, he fondly hoped that he had secured liberty to his people. But alas, he relied in vain on the honor of a king. The "Treaty" was but "the perjured preface" to the Penal Laws. Besides that of Limerick, there are two violated treaties—Mellifont and Kilkenny.

back his word, and continued his defence of Limerick. But the gallant soldier was too honorable to commit a breach of faith—what he had written he had written. He kept his troth, even though Dapping, Protestant Bishop of Meath, was teaching, *ex cathedra*, “the sinfulness of keeping your oath or faith with Papists,”—a sinfulness never committed in those days.

X.

The Irish army refusing to serve under William the Usurper, took service under the principal sovereigns of Europe; Ginckle strove hard to obtain these brave men for his master, but only about one thousand, mostly Englishmen or Ulster men, declined to go to the Continent. Twelve thousand two hundred entered the service of France,¹ increasing the Irish contingent there to nearly twenty thousand. This was the celebrated Irish Brigade, whose valor was gloriously displayed on almost every battle field in Europe. When Maria Teresa instituted fifty crosses of the Legion of Honor, forty-six of them were won by Irish officers. Louis XIV. loved to welcome these exiles to his armies, and always spoke of them as “my brave Irish.” Francis I. wrote: “The more Irish officers we have in the Austrian army the better.” In several battles they turned the scale against the English; when defeated by their bravery and skill, the despicable George II. exclaimed: “Cursed be the laws that deprive me of such subjects.” Yet this wretched creature added new and horrible enactments to the penal code already existing. In the English House of Commons it was said that more injury had been done to England and her allies by these exiles, than if all the Irish Catholics had been left in possession of their estates. To escape the penal laws, thousands of young men joined their friends in France, Spain and Austria, and many emigrated to America. In Georgia and the Carolinas they soon formed the majority; in 1729, fifty-six hundred Irish landed in Philadelphia. The total emigration to France amounted to one million, and from 1691 to the Revolution, four hundred and eighty thousand Irishmen died in the service of France. After the defeat of the English at Fontenoy, May 11, 1745, the government decreed the penalty of death against any Irishman enlisting in France. Among the thousands who won distinction in foreign lands are Cooke, O’Shaughnessy, Lacy (Russia), Tyrconnel (Prussia), Nugent, O’Connor, O’Brien, Lally, O’Reilly, Captain General of Cuba, Governor of Louisiana, Count McCarthy, and Marquis Casacalvo (O’Farrell), Louisiana. Sarsfield,² “the Irish Bayard,” *sans puer et sans reproche*, is com-

¹ Some not choosing either service returned to their homes.

² Sarsfield married Honora Burke, grand-daughter of the Baron of Brittas who suf-

memorated in Limerick by a fine bronze statue (Lawlor, sculptor). On the pedestal is the inscription:

"To commemorate the indomitable energy and stainless honor of General Patrick Sarsfield, Earl of Lucan, the heroic defender of Limerick during the sieges of 1690 and 1691, who died from the effects of wounds received at the Battle of Landen, 1693."

The site was presented by Most Rev. George Buttes, bishop of Limerick. The writer had the pleasure of seeing this statue tastefully decorated with flowers and banners, on the second centenary of Sarsfield's defeat of William III.

Frightful statutes followed the violation of the Treaty. William, Anne, George I., George II. enlarged the horrid code. A characteristic enactment of Anne gave a child who conformed to the Protestant religion, his father's estates, excluding other heirs. As the sister queens, Mary and Anne, had driven out their own father, it was supposed other children would not hesitate to grow rich in a similar way.¹ In these reigns Ireland touched the depths of her degradation; yet contraband intercourse with the great world abroad kept hope alive in the hearts of many. The Pretender, "the son of a King," was to them a hero, because he would not renounce the true religion for a triple crown. When the saintly Mary Beatrice passed away, they bewailed her in their poetic language, and in their poor cabins sang a "Lament for the Queen" when the day's work was done.

Meanwhile, the penal laws continued to debase those who executed them. "Where they were not bloody," says Edmund Burke, "they were worse; they were slow, cruel and outrageous in their nature, and kept men alive only to insult in their persons every one of the rights and feelings of humanity." Yet so slowly did the work of conversion proceed that it was computed it would take four thousand years to convert the Irish! Nay, they sometimes converted their masters. From the day that Strongbow married Eva, Englishmen and other foreigners in Ireland have shown a strong disposition to marry Irish wives.² Many of William's

fered the horrible death of a traitor, in 1610, because he had harbored a priest. Sarsfield's widow, Countess Honora, married James Stuart, Duke of Berwick, and thus became daughter-in-law to James II., and sister-in-law to queens Mary and Anne, the so-called Pretender, and Princess Louisa Stuart.

¹ The heroes and heroines of the Revolution were mostly cursed with bad sons or had none. William and Mary had no issue. Queen Anne's eighteen children all died young. The heir of the Duke and Duchess of Marlborough, Lord Blandford, died a boy. Bishop Burnet's sons were daring reprobates. Thomas wrote a song on his father's death, beginning:

"The fiends were brawling
When Burnet descending!"

² The proudest Norman invaders of Ireland sought Irish wives, but the Normans in

men,¹ and not a few Hessians of a later date, settled in the country and married Irish maidens. Ireton commanded his officers not to marry Irishwomen on pain of being cashiered. Yet many strict Catholics are descended from Cromwell's own soldiers.

Though ground to the dust, the Irish² had comfort in hearing of the glorious career of their countrymen abroad. "Wherever the Irish served," says Fornman, "they had the good fortune to distinguish themselves; and it may be said, to their eternal honor, that from the time they entered the service of France, they had never the least blot on their escutcheon." At home, though "doomed to death they were fated not to die." Far on in the next century they spoke their ultimatum: "FREE TRADE, OR SPEEDY REVOLUTION." In the Irish Parliament, April 16, 1782, Grattan's celebrated resolution passed unanimously.

"That the kingdom of Ireland is a distinct kingdom, with a Parliament of her own, the sole legislator thereof—that there is no body of men competent to make laws to bind the nation, but the King, Lords, and Commons of Ireland,—nor any Parliament which hath any authority or power of any sort whatsoever in this country, save only the Parliament of Ireland."

Two hundred years have passed since the Treaty of Limerick was signed, October 3, 1691, and violated. And to-day, after a strange and wonderful history, the Irish race is pre-eminently Catholic at home and abroad, supplying the English-speaking Catholic world, to a great extent, with clergy and teachers. Foreigners settling in Ireland have mostly been absorbed into the race, and are one with it in religion and love of the dear old land. May the good God who has upheld the ever faithful Isle in the past, be with her people in the future, to give them unity of sentiment and action, as well as unity of faith.

"Here came the brown Phœnician, a man of trade and toil—
Here came the proud Milesian, a hungering for spoil;
And the Kirboly and the Cyniry, and the hard enduring Dane,
And the irate lord of Normandy, with the Saxon in their train.

"And oh, it were a gallant deed to show before mankind,
How every race and every creed might be by love combined—
Might be combined, yet not forget the fountains whence they rose,
As filled by many a rivulet, the stately Shannon flows."

England would hold no social relations with the Saxons, whom they spoke of as little better than swine.

¹ This is how the late Bishop Hendricken of Providence, a native of Ireland, came by his name.

² Under no circumstances did the Irish ever give up their desire, their love, and their struggle for freedom. And this is, perhaps, the most remarkable feature of their history.

Scientific Chronicle.

THE PHOTOCRONOGRAPH.

WE hope our readers will not, at the outset, allow themselves to get frightened at the formidable looking word which heads this article. In the matter of inventions, long names have become almost a necessity, because the *name* is expected to be a pretty full etymological definition of the *thing*, and as a new invention is usually an addition to, or a modification of, an old one, and is supposed to introduce some new idea, a new root must be introduced into the name. Besides, a name which might fit almost perfectly to some new invention, may have already been applied to something else, and hence the necessity of another and usually a longer one. For example, we have an instrument for seeing small objects, and appropriately called a *microscope*; another for measuring small distances, and therefore called a *micrometer*. When the two instruments are combined to be used as one, a name was obtained by a clumsy juxtaposition, thus: *micrometer-microscope*. We think the two words might have been spliced more neatly, and had we been godfather in this instance, we would have suggested "*micrometroscope*."

On the other hand, when Léon Scott, about thirty years ago, invented an instrument by which sound-vibrations registered themselves, he called it a *Phonautograph*, a name perfectly appropriate. When Edison invented a much more perfect instrument, which not only left a mark (*graph*), but which would reproduce sounds similar to the ones it had received, he thought himself lucky in finding a shorter word (*Phonograph*). It is defective, however, for the reason that the idea of *self-registering* is left out, as is also the idea of the *reproduction* of the sound. Had these two ideas been embodied in the word, we would probably have had a name long enough to satisfy the most fastidious purists.

It is conceded by even the most advanced would-be iconoclasts of the classics, that all new names of inventions should be drawn from either the Latin or the Greek, preferably from the latter, and that no mixtures of different languages in the same word should be tolerated.

"Photochronograph" is all Greek, but it may be done into Anglo-Saxon somewhat after this fashion: "An Instrument for Registering Time by means of Light." Since, however, an essential part of the instrument is an electro-magnet, and since also it is *self-registering*, the full name should be:

"PHOTO-ELECTRO-MAGNETO-AUTO-CHRONOGRAPH."

Doubtless this name did occur to the inventor, but we cannot blame him if he recoiled before such a monster.

The Photochronograph may be applied to many purposes in astronomy and physics, though the use for which it was specially invented, and the one to which it has been so far principally applied by the in-

ventor, is the recording of star transits. It has been described briefly in some of the daily papers, but we believe it of such enduring merit as to be deserving of more than a mere passing notice, and we therefore intend to describe it somewhat in detail.

In a modest pamphlet of thirty-six pages, printed at Washington, D. C., by Stormont & Jackson, the inventor, Rev. Geo. A. Fargis, S. J., assistant astronomer of the Georgetown Observatory, and Rev. John G. Hagen, S. J., director of the same, have described, the former, the instrument itself, the latter, a few of the results already attained by its use, in the matter of star transits.

To the scientific world, the pamphlet will be perfectly intelligible, and, for the present, leaves nothing to be desired; but for those not well versed in scientific matters, some parts of it would probably be found rather too technical and abstruse. With the kind permission therefore of the authors, we propose to lay before our readers a sketch of the instrument, and of its use in recording star transits, a sketch which we hope to make rather fuller than those which have appeared in the newspapers, and yet not so deep as to drown the intelligent non-scientific reader.

Before getting down to the Photochronograph itself, however, we must beg leave to introduce some preliminary considerations which will lead up to it, and serve to make it more easily understood and more thoroughly appreciated.

First of all then, what is meant by a "star transit?" In the year 1874 and again in 1882, expeditions were sent out by different governments, to various parts of the world, to observe the *transit of Venus*. In the April number of this REVIEW, a special article described the forthcoming *transit of Mercury*, which was to take place on the 9th of May. By "transit," in these cases, is meant the passage, or apparent passage of the planet across the disc of the Sun. Now, although the *planets* may, generically, be called *stars*, yet the transits just mentioned are *not* what we properly call "star transits." A true star transit is the passage of a star across the *meridian* of the place where the observation is made. We sometimes meet men, not to count women and children, who do not appear to know clearly what is meant by "meridian." Let us then try to get a grip on the "meridian." Geometry tells us that only one plane can pass through three given points. Let now the three given points be: (1), the North Pole of the earth, (2), the South Pole of the earth, and (3), the eye of the observer; and let the plane, fixed as to position by these three points, extend outwards all around to the boundary of the universe. The line traced by that plane on the surface of the earth, from pole to pole, is the *geographical*, or *earth-meridian* for the place where the observer stands. Each point on the earth has a different meridian from every other point which is not directly north or south of it. The poles of the heavens are the spots in the sky to which the axis of the earth points, and hence the astronomical meridian (the one we have to deal with in transits) may be called the line on the sky between *these* poles, and vertically over the geographical meridian; but

it is better, practically, to consider as meridian the whole plane between these two lines.

On arriving at this point we at first imagined that we had made matters sufficiently clear, but on second consideration they seemed to begin to look a little muddy. Let us try again. Take an apple, as nearly a true sphere as can be had. Run a knitting-needle straight through the centre from the stem to the—well, to the other end. The apple represents the earth, the needle indicates the position of the earth's axis; the points where it comes through at each end are the poles. Now, tie a fine thread to the needle at one pole; stretch the thread tight and as direct as may be to the other pole, over the surface of the apple. If we imagine that thread to be an absolutely mathematical line; that is, having no thickness, it may be called the *pomographical* or *apple* meridian for every point over which it passes. In like manner other lines may be drawn—in your mind's eye, at least—from pole to pole, over the whole surface, so that every point of the surface will be on one meridian or another. A line drawn around the middle, equidistant from each pole, will be the equator. Next, place the apple so that its axis will be inclined a certain number of degrees from the vertical (according to your latitude), and imagine yourself a tiny speck on the highest point of the apple. (Many of us will have little difficulty in imagining that.) The line on which you then stand, in thought, will be your meridian. A line on the sky, directly overhead of this, and corresponding exactly to that meridian, will be your celestial, or astronomical, meridian; or, better, as we have said above, the whole flat surface which reaches from the one to the other may be considered as such.

As the earth turns on its axis from west to east, all the stars *appear* to travel towards the west, except those below the pole, and *they* appear to move towards the east. This movement of the stars, our Sun included, is only apparent, but that fact need not concern us in the least, since all we care about here is the *change of relation* between points on the surface of the earth and the stars, and that *change* would be the same, whether the stars were at rest and the earth revolving on its axis towards the east, or the earth were at rest and the stars sweeping round in unthinkable circles towards the west.

A star transit for a given place, is said to be the *passage* of a star *across* the meridian of that place. This is so very exact that it might be misleading. What we want to know particularly is the *exact instant of time at which* the centre of a star is *in* the plane of the meridian. To determine this might seem to the uninitiated a very simple matter; thus, set up a telescope in the meridian, that is, pointing due north and south; observe the star till it comes to the middle of the field of view, and *then* look at your watch. Very simple indeed. But how near would that crude method bring us to the truth? Within two or three seconds perhaps; a result which all astronomers know would be absolutely worthless. You might as well try to mark time by the consecutive, hysterical outbursts of a cackling hen.

We would like to know the *exact* time when a star (any star, each and

every star) makes its transit; but we know that we have not got it yet for even one of them, and, strictly speaking, we have no hopes that we ever shall. All that we can expect is an approximation, but we want that approximation as near to the truth as human skill and ingenuity can make it. For the present we would not complain if we could get it surely to within, say, the one-thousandth of a second of time. Indeed, this would be a magnificent result; but we now have some hopes that it may soon be obtained—at least, for some of the stars. The obstacles in the way are numberless; a few of them will come up for consideration as we go along.

Star transits were observed, in a rough way, ages ago; but it was not until after the invention of the telescope that any results worthy of being recorded were obtainable. The telescope used for transits is mounted especially for this purpose. It is set up permanently on an axle lying east and west, the telescope itself, therefore, pointing north and south. This setting up must be done with the greatest care. The axle must be rigorously horizontal; otherwise, the telescope would swing aside from the meridian when elevated or depressed, and would then be correct for only one position. The supporting piers must be as solid as the framework of the earth itself; the tube must be inflexible, and be balanced true, and yet be capable of turning on its axle with the touch of a finger, and at the same time be capable of being clamped rigidly in any given position without derangement of its axis. The lenses must be perfectly set, and all their centres must be exactly in the axis of the telescope. All these things being supposed done as perfectly as possible, there still remains to test for and take into account any possible errors that may yet lurk in the instrument and its mounting, or that may declare themselves anew from time to time. The greatest part of the work in this, as in all other kinds of fine measurements, seems to be the hunting up of errors and the calculation of the *probable* allowance to be made for them. "One half of the world don't know how the other half lives." Let us change the wording a little, and it will be at least as true in its new form as in the old. Nine hundred and ninety-nine thousandths of the world (the non-scientific part) don't know how the other one-thousandth (the scientific part) does its work.

In order to render the telescope useful for anything like fine work, it must be provided with "*spider lines*." When we look through a telescope we see that it takes in a certain amount of space of a circular form; this is called the *field* of the instrument. The axis of the telescope lying in the meridian we must know when the star is in the line of that axis. Gaessing will not do here; it must be determined correctly. For this purpose a fine line is stretched vertically across the eye-piece of the telescope in such a way that to the observer it will appear as a line exactly across the middle of the field. Another is, in like manner, stretched horizontally, and its intersection with the first is intended to determine the centre of the field. The line from the centre of the object-glass to the centre of the eye-piece is the optical alignment or *collimation line* of the instrument. But besides these two fun-

damental lines a whole system of others is inserted, by which the field is divided, from the centre, into spaces of equal width. The entire system of lines is called the *reticule*. The lines themselves are simply threads spun by some friendly spider; no human spinning or wire-drawing has been found equal to the work of the spider. Poor, maligned, hated, despised, dreaded spider, what were you made for? To catch flies, sir. Ah, no; look up. You were made to spin us lines to catch—not flies, but the far-off, wondrous, mighty, revolving worlds of space. The spider, however, does not believe in this system of regular squares, probably because he is not built that way, and so he will, if he gets a chance, try to improve matters by weaving a pattern of his own. This is a source of great annoyance in a telescope, though it can hardly be called an error; it is rather a delusion and a snare.

The first serious attempts at recording star transits were made thus: An observer stationed at a telescope watched a known star moving across the field. At the same time, with the other eye, he watched the observatory clock until the star was *near* the vertical spider-line; then, not being dual-minded or cross-eyed enough to be sure of catching both the star and the clock at once, he concentrated his whole *seeing power* on the star, and continued the time observation by listening to and counting the ticks of the clock. When now he judged that the star was exactly bisected by the vertical spider-line, he *estimated* mentally the fraction of a second between the last tick and the instant of transit as seen by the eye, and so recorded it. This is called the *eye-and-ear* method of observation, and has been, and is yet, extensively used for many other purposes besides star-gazing.

Strange to say, in these observations the ear, though not by any means perfect, is much more reliable than the eye. One reason for this may be that the ear hears nothing till the click comes; it comes suddenly, and ends almost as suddenly as it comes, while the eye is *all the time* watching the moving point of light and the vertical line. For fear of being too soon or too late, it hesitates, concentrates its attention again, backs out and starts over, and so sends the judgment through a series of acrobatic starts, stops and plunges that remind one of the attempt to catch a foul ball on the hop. Another reason why the eye is not to be relied on is that, even supposing the retina to be everywhere equally sensitive (which, however, is not the case), the eye becomes tired, the observer gets nervous, and when he thinks he has just got it, the star-image dances a regular hornpipe back and forth across the spider-line, as if to say, "Now catch me if you can."

This method, which was first thought to give quite accurate results, is thus found to be liable to considerable danger of error. The error, whatever it may be, inseparable from this method is called one's *personal error*, to distinguish it from errors that are due solely to imperfections in the instruments, and which are thence called *instrumental errors*. The personal error is different for different individuals and different in the same individual for different classes of work and for the varying circumstances of time and place, of rest and fatigue, and of other physical conditions.

It enters more or less into all observations of whatever kind, whether made by the eye, the ear or the sense of touch, and robs them of that ideal perfection which is the dream of the scientist.

Attempts are made to correct it by what is known as the *personal equation*; that is, a man, by long and careful attention, aided by a machine made for the purpose, may find out approximately what his average personal error is for various classes of work, and make this knowledge enter, as a correction, in the subsequent calculation of results. In any case, the correction is but an approximation, and hence strictly accurate results cannot be expected from any personal observation, however carefully made. Moreover, the personal error is usually much larger than instrumental ones.

The personal errors in the different parts of a given observation may, it is true, tend in opposite directions; that is, some may be above, some below the mark, and thus they may neutralize each other more or less completely; but of this we cannot ordinarily have any assurance. On the other hand, they *may* all be pulling in the same direction, and so may, by their addition, constitute a relatively large final error. The knowledge of one's personal equation will help him some here, as will also the application of the doctrine of probabilities, but the final outcome will be that there will always remain a doubt as to the accuracy of the result within certain limits. For example, we may know that we are right, in a given case, to within the one-tenth or the one-hundredth of a second either above or below the truth, but nearer than that we cannot get under the given circumstances.

Later on, improvements were made in the methods of observing star transits, by the chronograph with an electric make-and-break circuit. This instrument consists of a cylinder covered with a sheet of paper, and made to revolve regularly by clockwork, at a convenient rate. A pen is held lightly against the paper by a spring, and is moved forward regularly by a revolving screw, in a direction parallel to the axis of the cylinder. When at work, therefore, it traces a spiral line on the paper around and around the cylinder. The pen is connected with the armature of an electro-magnet in such a way that when the current passes the pen is pulled aside, and when the current ceases the pen returns to its former position, thus making a V-shaped jog or indentation in the line. The make-and-break in the current is brought about by the pendulum of the observatory clock, and hence the jogs on the spiral line are at equal distances apart, each interval representing a second of time. Appropriate means are taken to indicate the beginning of each minute. The observer, having this instrument at hand, watches the star crossing the field, and when it is bisected by the middle vertical line of the field, which represents the meridian, he touches an electric button, and an extra jog is thus made in the line. Its position among the regular pendulum jogs will indicate the instant when the electric contact was made by the button.

This improvement rids us of the personal error due to the ear, but not of that due to the eye of the observer. It takes time for the light

to make its impression on the retina of the eye ; it takes time for the impression received by the eye to be transmitted to the brain ; it takes time for the will to set the hand in motion, and it would require an impossible degree of skill to adjust the stroke on the button accurately to the instant of transit. Besides, the chronograph has the defect of introducing private little errors of its own. These are due principally to irregularities in the clock-work and in the screw which drives the pen. Still, on the whole, the chronograph method, as described, gives better results than the eye-and-ear method.

Still we are not satisfied, for

"The fiend that man harries is love of the best."

What further improvement is possible? The only thing that remains seems to be to dispense with the observer himself, as such, and so eliminate *all* personal error. This looks paradoxical enough—an observation without an observer! Nevertheless, it has been attempted. How? Why, by persuading a photographic plate to take the place of the eye of the observer. Could this succeed, it was foreseen that the chronograph too might go, or at least be pensioned off on half pay.

This idea had been suggested by Faye, as far back as 1849, "but," says Professor Young, "it is only recently that any serious attempt has been made to put the idea in practice." In January, 1886, Professor E. C. Pickering first tried it at the Harvard College Observatory. The trial was valuable chiefly in indicating the possibilities opened up by the method. In the summer of 1888 Professor Pickering made some further experiments, which are thus described by Professor Frank H. Bigelow, of the Washington Naval Observatory: "A small plate (photographic) was attached to the armature of a magnet, by which a movement up and down, perpendicular to the star trail through a very small interval, could be communicated to it, by making and breaking the circuit at fixed intervals, either by hand or by the clock, the latter requiring a commutator in which the makes and breaks should be of equal lengths. The effect was to leave on the plate a pair of dotted lines close together." (The star trail is the line along which the *image* of the star moves, while the star itself is crossing the field.) The next thing requisite was to devise some means of determining to which dot, or to what position between two dots, the actual instant of transit corresponded. Several methods were tried, with doubtful success; but finally Professor Bigelow found that by shining a light into the objective for two or three seconds, the whole plate could be fogged down without seriously obscuring the dotted trail, while the lines of the reticule were photographed on the plate. From these lines to the dots measurements could be made by the micrometroscope, at leisure, and repeated till satisfactory. During the summer of 1889, Professor Bigelow and Father Hagen made some further trials with improved apparatus, at the Georgetown College Observatory, but they could not be followed up, as Professor Bigelow was called away to take part in the West African Eclipse Expedition.

Just then, luckily, Father Fargis was appointed assistant at the Observatory, and the whole business was put into his hands. He set to work immediately and the result was, in a surprisingly short time, the invention of the Photochronograph. Want of space hindering us from entering into all the mechanical details of its construction, we will try to make intelligible its salient points at least.

The defects inherent in the best methods heretofore tried were chiefly the following: First, the idea of imparting motion to the sensitive plate was, if not theoretically wrong, at least practically unsafe; secondly, the weight of the moving parts (the armature, the plate and the plate-holder) must necessarily occasion undesirable vibrations and a certain amount of unsteadiness of action, and this again might react on the battery and render its action less regular; thirdly, there was danger of a *photographic parallax*, which means that the lines of the reticule, being at a considerable distance from the sensitive plate, their photographic images would be more or less thickened and possibly displaced; fourthly, there was danger of the partial obliteration of the star trail in photographing the spider lines.

Truly, on looking these difficulties in the face, one would think that we were as far away as ever from the object sought, but the ingenuity and perseverance of Father Fargis and the knowledge gained by experience overcame them all. We will take them up in their order. To overcome the objection to the movement of the plate, "it was decided," says Father Fargis, "that the sensitive plate *should not move*, the result of which decision was the invention of the *occulting bar*." The sensitive plate was therefore *fixed*, in a holder itself *fixed* to the eye-piece of the telescope, but not just in the place where the eye of the observer would otherwise be; for the rays of light which give the best picture to the eye are not those which act best on the chemicals of the photographic film, so that the plate had to be set back a little further than for clear vision. This difference of focus was determined with great care and much labor, and was found, in the case of the telescope at command, to be about $\frac{1}{7}$ of an inch. This may appear a trifle, but it is enough to make all the difference between good and bad, between success and failure.

If now the sensitive plate were exposed to the light of a star crossing the field, it would show, after development, a dark horizontal line on a light back-ground. This photographed star-trail would afford no basis for time-measurement, since it had no connection with the clock. Just here comes in the occulting bar, the pith of the whole invention. An electro-magnet is properly fastened to the eye-end of the telescope, and its weight counterbalanced by a weight on the opposite side of the other end. To its armature is soldered a strip of steel about $\frac{1}{12}$ of an inch wide and $\frac{1}{125}$ of an inch thick, that is, about half as thick as an ordinary tin-type plate. This strip stretches across the reticule, through a hole in the side of the telescope tube, and when *held down* by the electro-magnet, *shuts off the light* of the star from the central zone of the plate, whence the name "*occulting bar*." When the bar is released it rises

and exposes the plate, and this alternate covering and exposing of the plate breaks the star-trail up into a series of dots. The electro-magnet is connected with the observatory clock, and hence the occulting bar is pulled down and released every second. The end of a minute is indicated by the omission of the last dot of the minute. An extremely neat arrangement permits the time of exposure to be varied from $\frac{1}{10}$ to $\frac{9}{10}$ of a second. This is necessary for two reasons; first, because of the varying luminosity of different stars; secondly, because the apparent motion of a star is greater or less according as it is nearer to or further from the celestial equator. A faint star requires a longer exposure than a bright one, and a rapidly moving one would leave dashes instead of dots, if the exposure were too long. Theoretically, they can in no case be truly circular dots, because however short the time of exposure the image of the star *has moved a little during* that exposure. The shorter the time of exposure, then, the better it would be, if, during that time, a distinct picture could be obtained. This distinctness depends first on the amount and color of the light furnished by the star; over this we have no control; secondly, on the sensitiveness and structural perfection of the photographic film, in which, advances are being made almost continually. At any rate, the first two defects, the motion of the plate and weight of moving parts, with consequent irregularity and unsteadiness, are completely obviated. Even the battery has now so little to do that it can hardly find an excuse for not doing that little well.

The parallax next demands attention. Theoretically, this difficulty could be settled by putting the spider lines in *contact with* the photographic plate, but evidently they would not stand that treatment. Neither can they be placed *very close* to it (which would be the next best thing), since, in working in the dark, they would inevitably be broken in handling the plates. Another bit of ingenuity was needed here. It came in the shape of plate glass on which were ruled one horizontal and one vertical line. This was substituted in place of the spider lines, and the sensitive plate was placed almost in contact with it, thus reducing the danger of a parallax to a minimum. The horizontal line is used merely for setting the stars, and for adjusting the occulting bar parallel to the path of the star. The vertical one is used, of course, to show the true instant of transit.

The fourth defect (the partial obliteration of the dots in photographing the reticule) is remedied very simply by keeping the occulting bar *down* during that operation. This covers the line of dots and protects them *perfectly* from fogging, a result only second in importance to the invention of the occulting bar itself.

The photochronograph being now ready we will follow the inventor while he gets in a night's work. We will describe it in about his own words.

About an hour before the observations begin, the *roof-shutters* of the observatory are opened, so as to equalize the temperature indoors and out, and the caps are taken off the telescope. In the meantime, every-

thing about the telescope is put in ship-shape order—the levels are put in position—the batteries are tested—the movement of the occulting bar is adjusted by the proper screws—sensitive plates of different grades are got in readiness, and measures are taken to secure them firmly in the plate-holder, and to protect them from any stray light, either before or after use—lamps for room-work, and for photographing the reticule are got ready, and a special one for reading the levels—a handy notebook and the star-list of the principal stars that will cross the meridian for the next few hours, are arranged in convenient places. The level is then read and its indications for both east and west readings, recorded, together with the date, the temperature, the state of the atmosphere, and the time by the observatory clock.

The telescope is now set on any star about to cross the meridian. The current is turned on, and an *eye-observation* is made of the working of the photochronograph. By means of a sliding eye-piece the eye of the observer takes the place, for the nonce, of the sensitive plate and the working of the occulting-bar is carefully observed. This operation affords the observer a striking illustration of his personal equation. For, the armature-beats, at the appearance and disappearance of the star, enable him to appreciate the slowness of the retina in receiving and losing the star image, reminding him that the star is not seen where it actually is, but where it was just a moment before.

A star is now chosen from the list, the transit instrument is *set* on it, and clamped. When the star is just entering the field, the occulting-bar is adjusted for the exposure desired, and the sensitive plate is slipped into its place. When the star has crossed the field, the current is turned on to the photochronograph alone, by which operation the occulting-bar is *held down*. A light is then held to the object glass of the telescope; this photographs the vertical line, and then the plate is put away, ready for development. The process is continued for other stars during four or five hours, thus securing from twenty to thirty plates. The work of development is done later.

We will pass over the photographic part of the work, and suppose that we have a number of negatives all properly finished. The next step is the measurement of these negatives. The distance of each dot from the vertical line is carefully measured by the micro-metroscope; the mean of all the measures is taken, and after a thousand and one calculations and corrections for instrumental errors, the description of which would carry us far beyond the scope of this article, the final results are entered in the book of star-records.

The outcome of all this is that we have an instrument by which the *personal error is entirely eliminated*, and that is precisely what astronomers and physicists have always been looking for, but which no one ever found before.

The authoritative star-catalogue of the world is the *Berlin Jahrbuch*. Its records are the results of hundreds of observations for each star, and it represents the work of many long years by many patient workers; yet, a single careful observation by the photochronograph, under good

atmospheric conditions, is probably of greater value than the corresponding result in the *Jahrbuch*. What then will it be when the same star has been observed by the new method a dozen or a score of times? In the *Jahrbuch* the probable error in the places of the stars is within some hundredths of a second; by the photochronograph this error will be reduced to within some thousandths of a second, a result that will gladden the hearts of astronomers for years to come. No star record can hereafter be considered of any account unless obtained by this method.

At the Georgetown Observatory it is proposed to continue what has been so happily begun, and indeed the work of observation and computation is being vigorously pushed at the present time. It is hoped that within the next year and a half, the places of about 120 stars (ranging from the 1st down to the 3.6th magnitude) will be determined. This will represent from 1100 to 1200 observations of stars included between the 30th parallel south, and the 67th parallel north of the equator, and will be the foundation of a catalogue far more reliable than any hitherto known.

To do this properly, however, and especially to be enabled to observe stars of still lesser magnitudes, a special photographic telescope is sadly needed, as is likewise a more perfect micrometroscope for the measurement of the plates. It is a great pity that the devoted men engaged in this important work should be hampered by the lack of a few good instruments.

Want of space prevents us from entering into any details as to the good of all this refinement in determining the places of the stars. Suffice it for the present to say, in general, that by it alone can the old problem as to whether the stars have a proper motion of their own, be definitely solved; that by it alone can the *true* latitude and longitude of places be determined, and the living astronomical question of the age, as to whether latitudes and longitudes are changing or not, be satisfactorily answered. The practical bearing of these things on navigation and commerce needs no elucidation here. In bringing this article to a close, we have but to add: God speed the work and bless the workers.

MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE.

THIS association held its annual meeting this year at Washington, D. C. It lasted from the 19th to the 25th of August, and took place in the halls and class-rooms of the Columbian University. In former years the QUARTERLY REVIEW has given an account of the details of the meetings. This time we deem it would be more interesting to give some account of the association itself, of its history, its aims and its methods.

Fifty-one years ago a small but enthusiastic body of students of geology and natural history organized themselves into a definite association. Previous to this time scientific societies in this country had been merely

local, both as to membership and the ends in view. The new one proposed to strike out on a broader path, and to gather to itself as many workers as possible from all parts of the country. The name adopted: "*Association of American Geologists and Naturalists*," is suggestive of this. The success of the undertaking was so gratifying that, after an existence of eight years, it was decided to widen still further the scope of the Association, so as to include students not only in geology and natural history, but in every branch of natural science. To indicate this the name was changed to "THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE." The long-headed ones in those days seemed to think that a long name would reach further, wind itself around a greater number, as it were, and perhaps last longer than the puny, little names heretofore in vogue; but in our times, when we are all in a hurry, we have abbreviated it, colloquially at least, to "A. A. A. S." A Constitution was framed and adopted, of which the first Article runs thus:

"The objects of the association are, by periodical and migratory meetings, to promote intercourse between those who are cultivating science in different parts of America, to give a stronger and more general impulse and more systematic direction to scientific research, and to procure for the labors of scientific men increased facilities and a wider usefulness."

The first meeting under the new name was called in Philadelphia, September 20, 1848. The practice since then has been usually to hold a meeting once a year, although there have been a few exceptions. In 1850 and again in 1851 there were two meetings, while in 1852 there was none. During our civil war (1861 to 1865 inclusively) no meetings could be held. Taking these breaks into account we find that the meeting of this year is the fortieth of the A. A. A. S.

The idea of having no permanent headquarters has proved to be an excellent one. At each meeting a new place is chosen for the succeeding one, generally on the invitation of some scientific society or of the civil authorities of the city itself. Twenty-nine different cities of the United States have thus tendered hospitality, one or more times, to this nomadic association, and had their offers accepted, while Montreal has been honored twice by their presence and Toronto once. Next year Rochester will open its arms to receive us, and without being a prophet we may safely venture to predict that Chicago will welcome us in 1893. We hope so at least.

Had the association established itself permanently in any one city, it would hardly have been known outside of that city, but by adopting the migratory plan, it brings itself to the knowledge of a much larger number, and, as with all good things, to be known is to be loved. The roll of membership shows this very plainly. At the start in 1848 the total number of members was 461. In the course of years the number has fluctuated a good deal, down and up, but the present year stands at the head, the number of members having mounted to 2182, of which about 6 per cent. are ladies. The lowest ebb was reached in 1867

when there were only 415 members. Since the beginning, 578 names have appeared on the death-roll.

The actual attendance at the meetings varies greatly, depending, of course, in the first place, on the number of enrolled members; to some extent also on the size and location and general convenience of the place chosen, and probably a good deal on its scientific status or state of intellectual *culture*. The smallest number present at any meeting was 73, out of a total membership of 415, being rather less than 18 per cent. This was at Burlington in 1867. The lowest percentage, however (11 per cent.) was at Cincinnati in 1851, and the next (12 per cent.) at Buffalo in 1866, the first meeting after the war. Ten years before that Albany had mustered nearly 53 per cent. of a total of 722. In 1884 Philadelphia came to the front with a total membership of 1981 and an attendance of 1261 (over 63 per cent.), but this was in part due to the presence of members of the British Association whose meeting in Montreal had just been concluded and who, as honorary guests, were numbered in the attendance. But the palm must be awarded to Boston, where, in 1880, out of 1555 members, 997 (over 64 per cent.) were on hand. This will be recognized immediately as being according to the eternal fitness of things. Boston beans and Bunker Hill will always stand near the head of the list, even if we were to forget the Blue Stockings. As stated above, the total membership at the present is 2182, the attendance at Washington was about 700, thus placing it among the most successful meetings yet held, at least in point of numbers.

It might be well just here to correct an error which seems to have taken hold on the minds of a certain number. It has been hinted at times that the association is composed of second-rate men, who do not represent the real scientific talent of the country. We will readily admit that all are not equal, the Declaration of Independence to the contrary notwithstanding, but we assert that the very best men of science in the country have belonged to it from the beginning, and continue to belong to it to this day. The list would be too long to insert here; we will merely jot down a few of the names about which we feel there will be no dispute. Thus: Joseph Henry, Louis Agassiz, Asa Gray, the two Sillimans, Henry Draper, Jas. B. Eads. These, and many more as worthy as they, have passed away. Among those yet living we have T. Sterry Hunt, Jas. D. Dana, C. A. Young, S. Newcomb, Frank Bigelow, Geo. F. Barker, E. S. Holden, Thos. A. Edison, Asaph Hall, Joseph Le Conte, J. S. Newberry, E. C. Pickering, A. W. Greely, E. L. Zalinsky, Chief Justice Fuller, Oliver W. Holmes. These are a few of the better known ones, but there are dozens of others, presidents of universities, professors, astronomers, navy and army engineers, physicians, lawyers, clergymen and specialists of all kinds, some already eminent in the sciences, some well ahead on the road to eminence, some only beginning, but all in dead earnest, ever striving onward and upward.

The president and other officers are elected every year, except the treasurer and permanent secretary, and no one but the permanent secretary receives any salary.

The whole association is divided into eight sections: A. Mathematics and Astronomy; B. Physics; C. Chemistry; D. Mechanical Science and Engineering; E. Geology and Geography; F. Biology; H. Anthropology; I. Economic Science and Statistics. Each section is presided over by an officer with the title of vice-president and a secretary whose duty it is keep a record of all papers read in his section, and transmit them to the permanent secretary for publication.

The meetings last for a week, the first four days being devoted to serious work, the other three to scientific recreation, such as visiting such places of natural, historic and industrial interest that may be within reach. A general sessions of all present is held each morning of the four days, at which business matters and subjects of general interest are discussed and voted on, after which the sections retire to their respective quarters. Each vice-president reads a paper on some subject appropriate to his section, in which usually he takes a broad view of what has been accomplished during the year past by workers in that line throughout the world. Next follows the reading of the special papers that have been voluntarily offered by the members, and that have been previously passed upon by the council. These subjects are frequently illustrated by blackboard work, by diagrams, by photographs previously prepared, and even by complete instruments. At the close of the reading of each paper, a discussion follows in which every one has a right to take a hand, and of which many avail themselves. The discussion frequently lasts longer and is of more value than the original papers. All the papers are afterwards published in full, or in abstract, according to their importance, and form a volume of about 500 pages, which is distributed gratis to the members and offered for sale to the general public. To meet all expenses, an initiation fee of five dollars and an annual assessment of three dollars is levied on each member.

From the meagre account we have given, some, at least, of the advantages of the association will be apparent. A large body of scientific workers become personally known to each other, and this of itself is of no mean value; they learn what has lately been done and is yet being done in scientific matters, what new problems are springing up and what new attempts are being made to solve the old ones. They learn of the failures and of the successes of others, and consequently they have a guide for their own subsequent work. These things encourage men to go on, and courage is oftentimes the chief factor in the work. Besides, the funds of the association, though slender, are always available to help those who need them in any specially worthy investigation.

At the Washington meeting more than 250 papers were read and discussed, besides nearly 40 by members of the Entomological Club, whose meeting took place at the same time and place, and which was attended by many members of the association. Many of the papers, especially in sections A, D and H were of high merit, but it would be impossible even to summarize them here. The discussions and criticisms of the various papers were carried on with vigor, but in a perfectly frank and cordial manner and in a spirit that reflects honor on all concerned. In conclusion, we will only say: Long life and success to the A. A. A. S.

THAT RAINFALL.

THE readers of this REVIEW will remember that in the April Chronicle there appeared a short article entitled "Rain on Tap." It was there said that it was intended to try to produce rain artificially by the use of explosives, and that the experiments were to take place under the auspices of the United States Government. The experiment has since been tried, and, if we may believe the reports in the daily papers, it has proved a success. The time and place chosen were about the most unpromising that could be thought of—the month of August and the Llano Estecado, or Staked Plain, of Texas.

Gen. R. G. Dyrenforth was at the head of the expedition. His companions were Edward Powers, the author of "War and the Weather," who has for twenty years been trying to have his idea tested, and has at last succeeded; Dr. C. A. O. Roswell, a government chemist and Patent Office Examiner; Prof. Geo. E. Curtis, of the Smithsonian Institute, a meteorologist; Paul E. Draper, a well-known electrician; John T. Ellis, Gen. Dyrenforth's first assistant; Prof. Carl E. Myers, the æronaut, and other scientific worthies, making up a party of fourteen (not thirteen) in all.

The ranch, or cattle farm, around the village of Midland, in the very heart of the dry lands of Texas, comprising 300,000 or more acres, is owned by Nelson Morris, of Chicago, who placed his festive cowboys at the disposal of the experimenters for the heavy parts of this unique entertainment.

A number of balloons, varying in capacity from 600 to 1000 cubic feet, were filled with an explosive mixture of two parts of hydrogen to one part of oxygen, and were exploded, at stated intervals, by electricity. Charges of dynamite and rackarock powder were tied to the tails of kites and exploded in like manner, besides other explosions on the ground, until old war men declared that, as far as noise was concerned, it was like the battle-days of thirty years ago, without, however, the rattling of small arms. The experiments were performed every time under a clear sky, when the "oldest inhabitant" would have been laughed at if he had ventured to predict rain.

After some hours of this kind of racket, the party retired to their quarters and waited for the results. And every time the results came in the shape of a smart rain, within twelve hours, at most, after the cessation of hostilities. At times the rain was accompanied by violent thunder and lightning. The rain came—not once or twice only, but nine or ten times, and frequently covered an area of many miles in extent.

Can rain, then, be made to fall by the use of explosives? The ranchmen of Texas are jubilant, and say it can. Of all men the truly scientific man is the slowest to draw sweeping conclusions from a few experimental facts. He will say, "Try again; try other places; try other seasons, and don't prophesy until you are fairly sure." And try again they certainly will. At any rate, if the rain in Texas during last August was not produced by the explosives, it is, without doubt, the most remarkable series of coincidences ever recorded. Let us still hope on.

THE EARTH GOING ASTRAY.

THIS dear little earth of ours seems to be getting frisky in its old age. Ever since it was first generally believed that the earth had an axis of its own on which to rotate, it has been taken for granted that that axis was as securely fixed as if it were a crow-bar driven through from end to end. For some time past, however, astronomers and geographers have been suspecting that things are not exactly just so. The latest thing touching this question is a series of experiments, lasting for a whole year and carried on simultaneously in Berlin, Strasburg and Prague. They consisted of careful observations, from day to day, of the altitude of a given star; relying on which, the German astronomers believe they have discovered that the latitude of places in Europe is changing. If this be true, it means that the poles of the earth are getting loose, so to speak, and, consequently, that the equator and meridians are roaming about recklessly. This means, again, a change of climate, from hot to cold or from cold to hot, pretty much all over the whole world, and then—what?

But is such a change in the position of the earth's axis possible? Undoubtedly it is, and we may easily imagine what might be the cause of it. If the interior of the earth be in a liquid or semi-liquid state (as in all probability it is), then its motion of rotation would naturally tend to shift things around inside, and so disturb the centre of gravity, and this, in turn, would change the position of the axis.

Happily, the alleged change is very small, and, more happily still, it is not always in the same direction, but only an oscillation back and forth through about the $\frac{1}{38000}$ of a degree. If it gets no further than that we need not be troubled nor fear that the world will go all to smash—at least in our day. Whether there is even that much of a change or not will only be finally settled by the photochronograph. Supposing it proved, however, that the axis of the earth does change, we would be glad of it; for it would furnish us with another and a very strong proof that it is the earth, and not the sun, that “do move.”

 THE RAMIE FIBRE.

ABOUT two years ago (January, 1890,) a note appeared in the *QUARTERLY* on this subject. It was there stated, in substance, among other things, that the extraordinary strength of the ramie fibre—twice that of hemp—would render it valuable as a substitute for other fibres in the manufacture of cordage, twine, thread, sails, etc. Since then, improvements have been made in its culture and manufacture, which seem to point to its practical introduction on a large scale in the near future. We need something stronger than hemp, at times, and it looks now as if we should need a pretty constant supply.

But, in the present note our purpose is to call attention to a new and heretofore unsuspected use to which it may be applied, and that is, the manufacture of steam pipes! That a vegetable fibre should be found having properties that render it suitable for such a purpose, is simply marvellous. Yet it seems to be true.

The secret of the manufacturing process is merely in hardening the texture of the finished pipe by tremendous hydraulic pressure. Under this operation it becomes two and a half times as strong as steel, while remaining comparatively light. It will not absorb moisture, and consequently will not leak. It will neither swell nor shrink, and this is a point of the utmost importance. All the leaking of steam pipes, supposing them properly fitted at the outset, is due to the expansion and contraction occasioned by changes of temperature; this causes them to work loose at the joints and couplings, and sometimes even to break. When a system of piping is extensive, this becomes a great nuisance, as can be seen, for example, in the artificial hot geysers—steam volcanoes—that burst out so frequently in the lower parts of New York City, especially during the winter months.

The ramie pipe will not rot or rust; and for work buried under ground, this is another most valuable property, sadly lacking in iron and steel. Naturalists and epicures tell us that “a fish begins to spoil, all through, the moment he is dead.” A steam-pipe begins to rot, on the outside, as soon as it is buried. Coatings of asphalt, tar, and such things only put off the evil day a little longer, but, especially in damp places, do not afford permanent protection. The inside of the pipe is pretty safe while it is kept hot by live steam, but when it cools down, and air finds its way into the moist interior (as it never fails to do) active corrosion sets in. The ramie pipe is proof against all this.

Again, ramie is a non-conductor of heat, and this is precisely what we want. When steam is carried long distances through metal pipes, the loss of heat by radiation is very considerable, and in order to prevent this loss, as far as practicable, we jacket the pipes to a depth of two or three inches with some non-conducting substance, such as plaster, hair, asbestos. These do their work pretty well, but they are expensive, unsightly and clumsy. Now, if ramie is as good as it has been represented to be, it will replace all these with advantage, or rather, it will render jacketing about unnecessary. Moreover, ramie, in this hardened condition, is sufficiently incombustible to make it safe for use in steam-pipes.

What more could we ask? A gentleman of the *genus* called newspaper reporter, has kindly stooped to suggest that it would be just the thing for steam-boilers. Shades of Watts! Make a boiler out of a substance that will not conduct heat, and which is, at the same time, combustible? Try again. It is a vegetable substance; perhaps it might do to make boarding-house pies. *We* are content to stick to the steam-pipes.

A NEW USE FOR MILK.

MILK seems to have been originally intended as an article of food, for the early days at least of the lifetime of a good many animals, man himself being among the number, and this indeed is the only use made of it by the lower animals. Man, however, at the very dawn of history, learned the knack of appropriating to himself the milk of other animals, to make of it an article of diet throughout life, and of extracting from it butter and cheese. Later on it was discovered that milk would easily undergo fermentation, the product being a weakly alcoholic beverage called "koumyss." These are about the only uses known for milk down to our own day. But now a chemist comes forward and finds a new use for it in the industrial arts. We will describe in a few words the process he proposes to employ.

The milk is first coagulated as in the process of making cheese. This is then strained and the whey rejected. Ten pounds of the curd is taken and mixed with a solution of three pounds of borax in three quarts of water. This mixture is now placed in a suitable vessel over a slow fire, and left there till it separates into two parts, the one as thin as water, the other rather thicker, somewhat resembling melted gelatine. The watery part is next drawn off, and to the residue is added a solution of one pound of a mineral salt in three pints of water. Almost any mineral salt will answer; for example, sugar of lead, copperas, blue or white vitriol. This brings about another separation of the mass into a liquid and a mushy solid. The liquid is again got rid of by straining, or better, by filtering. At this point, if desired, coloring matter may be added; if not, the final product will be white. The solid is now subjected to heavy pressure in moulds of any desired shape, and afterwards dried under very great heat. The resulting product, which has been named "lactitis," is very hard and strong. It may be used in the manufacture of a great variety of articles, such as combs, billiard balls, knife handles, pen holders, in fine, for almost anything for which bone, ivory, ebonite, or celluloid have heretofore been employed; articles, of whose origin, the most advanced thinker among the cows would not have the slightest suspicion.

Book Notices.

MORALPHILOSOPHIE. von *Victor Cathrein, S. J.* Zweiter Band: Besondere Moralphilosophie. Freiburg im Breisgau. Herder'sche Verlagshandlung. 1891. Herder. St. Louis. \$3.25.

In our number for October, 1890, we gave a review of the first volume of this incomparable work on ethics by Father Cathrein, S. J. He then promised that the second volume on Special Ethics should appear in the course of a year. We have received the volume, and if the first was deserving of every praise that could be bestowed upon it, the second certainly deserves the same, not only because it is of greater interest, as treating of all the burning questions of the day, but also for the vast erudition, the keen analysis, the complete history, the searching criticism displayed in every subject treated. The author divides his work into two parts: The first treats of individual duties and rights; the second, of society. He subdivides the first part into five books, viz.: (I.) Man's relations to God, and in this he speaks of natural religion and its necessity; of supernatural religion and the relation between religion and morality; of religious indifferentism; the religious instinct; of the origin of religion; of religious worship and its acts, such as prayer and sacrifice, vows, oaths, superstition and irreligion. (II.) Man's relations to himself, to his soul, to his body; suicide. (III.) Man's relations to his fellow-man, or love of neighbor; on lying, self-defence, dueling. (IV.) Right of property; Socialism, its nature and history; reasons advanced in its defence; its impossibility; private ownership of the ground, in the light of history and its adversaries; the necessity of such ownership; Henry George's arguments; positive proofs for the right of property; right to transmit property; wills. (V.) Contracts; interest. The second part is divided into three books: (I.) On the family; marriage, its rights and duties; the emancipation of woman; relations of parents and children and servants; slavery. (II.) On the State, its origin, its nature, the limits of State authority; Church and State; State and school; Church and school; freedom of the Press; the social question; Liberalism; the functions of civil authority, how it may be acquired and how lost; the different kinds of governments. (III.) The right of nations; international law; war; the family of nations.

From this bare statement of questions, the reader can see how very important the work is; and we add, that nowhere have we seen so exhaustive and learned a treatment as that contained in this volume. There is a list of authors whose works are quoted, numbering over four hundred and fifty.

The intellectual conflict which the Church must wage to-day is no longer with this or that heresy; it is no more Catholicity versus Protestantism, but Christianity versus paganism. It is Church or no church. It is faith or infidelity. Modern paganism rejects the Holy Scriptures as the inspired Word of God, rejects Tradition, despises the fathers, doctors and theologians of the Church and takes its stand on reason alone. It knows nothing of the supernatural; will have nothing of it; rules it out of all discussion.

With such men the only appeal that can be effective is, to reason, to conscience, to history, to facts. Hence the necessity of a deeper knowl-

edge of philosophy both speculative and moral—Ontology, Psychology, Cosmology and Natural Theology, will answer all problems of the universe, of God, of man, and in doing so makes use of only the light of reason. Moral philosophy, using also only the same light, will answer the question why man is here and what he must do to work out his destiny. The infidel cannot reject its teachings. He must answer its arguments. He is constantly talking about rights, progress, culture, civilization, knowledge, humanity, honor. What are they? Are they possible without God, without obedience to law? The object of a true moral philosophy is to show from reason that without God, without His law, without His sanction for that law, life is a riddle, moral obligation an unreality, that might is right; that egotism and selfishness must be the only rule of conduct. Reason alone is sufficient to demonstrate that the only system of morality admissible is one that is in complete harmony with revelation. It is true that the modern Agnostic rejects the whole of this reasoning as a pure *petitio principii*, and our author mentions that difficulty on pp 69–70 of the first volume. The Agnostic objects that we take for granted that there is a personal God, the Creator of the world and of man. If that be granted, then the foundation of Christian morality necessarily follows; but we deny such a God, such a Creator. We want no theology, they cry; we consider man just as we find him and considering his nature, his aspirations, we deduce the laws which must direct him in his conduct. Our author admits that something must be taken for granted, but that the same difficulty must be answered by the Pantheist the Materialist or the Agnostic. He holds that ethics gives the best refutation of Pantheism and Materialism, and that “the moral law is the test and touchstone of every system of the world.” “*An der Sittenlehre muss jede Weltanschauung ihre Probe bestehen.*”

Whether the existence of God be admitted or not, Theism is the only rational moral philosophy. As a critic in the “*Civiltà*” argues, there is no begging the question as the Agnostic asserts. If the Christian philosopher supposes the existence of God, he has a right to do so, for it is a truth known and well proven. When an architect undertakes to erect a building, he takes for granted that the earth is there to build on. As he digs the foundation and comes down to the rock, ought he still to doubt? The existence of a personal God is certain and proven as it is certain and proven that the earth has power to support the buildings erected on it. If then from the existence of God it is logical according to our adversaries to deduce the moral system of Christian philosophers, then Theism is the only rational moral philosophy. The object of moral philosophy is not to prove the existence of God; no more is it the object of the architect to prove the solidity of the earth’s surface. It will not do to cry out “theology,” for as Cathrein observes we would then be forced to call Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Kepler, Newton, and even Kant, theologians (p. 69, vol. i.). But if even the existence of God be not admitted the moral system of Christian philosophers remains unshaken. It becomes a certain argument for the existence of a personal God; for all the principles of natural morality, of order, of right, of honor, of loyalty, of whatsoever goes to form the true dignity of human nature, cannot be preserved without admitting the existence of God. Just as the solidity of a building supposes the solidity of the earth, just as the swinging door supposes the hinges, just as a chain supposes a support; so without admitting a God, Creator, Legislator, Judge, it is impossible to explain anything in the moral order, it is impossible to preserve the idea of virtue and vice, of

good and evil. All would be reduced to selfishness and man would be degraded to the level of the brute.

Considering the great importance of all the questions treated, the patient research and profound philosophical analysis displayed throughout the work, it would be impossible for us to give in a book notice such a review as we would desire. We will mention only two subjects, which perhaps more than any others are now commanding public attention, viz., Socialism and the School Question. Our author devotes one hundred and forty pages to Socialism and the Rights of Property. He begins by defining Socialism and its relation to Communism, and then gives its history in ancient times; in the middle ages. Treats of the founders of Modern Socialism and its present position. He then examines the various arguments which are urged in favor of Socialism, and goes on to show the impossibility of the system. In treating of the right of property in general and of property in land in particular, he begins by criticism of the Belgian author, C. de Laveleye, who attacks the right of property or land from a historical standpoint, and whose arguments have been the arsenal from which Henry George and many others have borrowed their weapons. He then gives the history of such ownership as shown in the earliest Eastern peoples. The conclusion he draws is, that such ownership is as old as man, and that the higher the civilization of a people, the more developed this right. He then gives various theories invented to explain this right of property, examines and rejects those that are untenable, and defends at great length, that it is a natural right. In the last chapter of this article he treats of the doctrines of the fathers, doctors and theologians of the Church who have been freely quoted as the forerunners and defenders of the socialistic views. It is a *strange* chapter for a moral philosophy, and our author admits it, but as the defenders of Socialism, Bebel, H. Baudrillart, W. Roscher, Ritschdl and others have pressed their authority into their service, he has done well to consider the quotations from St. Ambrose, St. John Chrysostom, St. Thomas Aquinas, the Corpus Juris Canonici and such theologians as Soto, O.P., Card. Toledo, Card. de Lugo, Lessius, S.J., and Laymann, S.J., pp. 249-256, vol. ii. We thank the author specially for this chapter, as the authorities here quoted have been repeatedly urged in defence of Henry George. The question however of the right of property in general and of land in particular, has for Catholics been definitely settled by the late Encyclical of our Holy Father Leo XIII., on Labor and Capital.

In speaking of the school question, our author considers to whom does the right to educate children belong. He then speaks of the monopoly of education on the part of the State; of compulsory State schools; of compulsory schools and compulsory education; of the rights and duties of the State in the matter of schools. He considers the right the Church has to the religious education of youth; gives the history of the relation of the Church to schools, and then lays down the right the Church has in the school. Who has the right over the education of children? Our author begins by this fundamental principle:

"That parents are the nearest and direct educators of their children, or that they are called by God to take the first place in such education, appears to us so self-evident as to need no proof. But we go further and assert that, in the purely natural order, parents have the *sole* right to the immediate care and direction of the education of their children." p. 485.

Not to be accused of prejudice, as if he refused to Cæsar the things

that are Cæsar's, our author thus summarizes (p. 497) the rights and duties of the State in the matter of education and the school.

1. Civil authority has the right and the duty to tolerate no schools that propagate openly public errors, or are sources of immorality, or threaten danger to the community. It is clear that the right must be used honestly and justly, and must not serve as a shield for the advancement of party interests.

2. Civil authority has the right on its side to erect and conduct schools whenever and so far as private energy is insufficient, and as far as the public revenue may allow. Such public schools erected by the State should, however, be under the direction of the community, so as not to sever the school from the home; at least each community should have a determined influence in the appointment of teachers and the direction of the studies. Whenever the school becomes a State affair, it ceases to be under the influence of the family, and very easily becomes antagonistic to it. On the other hand, the civil authority has undoubtedly the right to watch over the proper distribution and use of the support it may grant.

3. Wherever in special cases it is shown that parents neglect entirely their children, and these thus threaten to become a burden and a danger to the community, the civil authority can compel such parents to fulfil their duty, and so, in case of necessity, to force them to send their children to school, or itself to care for their education, without detriment to the right of the Church.

4. As in our day it is commonly admitted that without an elementary education (reading, writing, arithmetic) it is absolutely impossible for any one to fulfil properly his duties as a citizen, the State has a right by law to impose on all children the duty of acquiring such knowledge. Compulsory education, but not compulsory schools.

5. The Church, to secure the religious education of children can, in certain cases, oblige parents to send their children to school. In such cases the State, acting with the Church, can oblige the children to attend school.

6. The State can demand of all who seek for positions in the civil service a certain amount of knowledge, and also determine what kind of knowledge is required.

7. As the State can erect schools, so can it also, as far as the revenue may allow without overburdening the tax-payer, institute libraries, clinics, scientific expeditions, etc., to advance the intellectual growth of the community.

We have given this lengthy notice of Father Cathrein's Moral Philosophy, hoping it may inspire some one to undertake its translation into English. For professors of ethics and moral theology, the book is invaluable. For all who desire to have at least one work on moral philosophy, we would say: If you read German, buy Cathrein's.

The work is enriched by two indices, the one, of all names quoted; the other, of all subjects treated.

A CHRISTIAN APOLOGY. By *Paul Schanz, D.D.*, Ph. Professor of Theology at the University of Tübingen. Translated by the *Rev. Michael F. Clancey*, Inspector of Schools of the Diocese of Birmingham, and *Rev. Victor J. Schobel, D.D.*, Professor of Dogmatic Theology at St. Mary's, Oscott. In Three Volumes. Vol. II., God and Revelation. 1891. New York and Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet & Co.

In reviewing the first volume of this great "Christian Apology," which treated of God and nature, we said that the work was clearly one

of the very best—if not pre-eminently the best—of the kind yet given us in the English language. Having read this second volume, which but the other day came from the press, and which treats of “God and Revelation,” we have to add, by way of commendation—and we do it with all cheerfulness—that our estimation of the work has been greatly enhanced. Every one familiar with the subject will understand the vastness and delicacy of the task he assumes who would enter upon a treatise of “God and Revelation.”

In the book before us the author has done this, and done it well. He has done this as only a great scholar and profound theologian could do. That in all the details of the work, the author's method or his views on certain questions men will concur, we do not suppose, but that all will admit him to be sound and safe on even the most delicate questions we feel assured.

His “History of Religion” is most thorough and clear, giving evidence in every line of the widest and most intelligent reading and broadest learning. So thorough and learned a history on the subject of which it treats, we have never before seen in our language.

But it is when he enters on the question of Christianity, and all that the treatment of it involves—the origin of Christianity, Revelation, Reason and Revelation, Prophecy and Inspiration, and the many other themes that are allied to them—that we are brought to a full appreciation of the true merit of the work. To enter upon those themes, or give the author's views of them, we have not the time nor inclination; indeed, in the scant space given to a book review we should do the author more harm than good. To all who desire a thorough knowledge, a most learned explanation of those questions, we recommend the work of Dr. Schanz.

A quotation from a retrospect of the work given by the translators will, we think, furnish a clearer notion of the high worth of this book than anything we could possibly say: “The subject of the second volume is supernatural revelation, especially the revelation through Jesus Christ. Since, however, according to Holy Scripture, supernatural revelation began in Paradise, it was absolutely necessary to follow the track of this primitive revelation through the religions of divers peoples.”

And at the present day this is a most important duty of the apologist, for the history of religion applies to the origin and growth of belief, the same principle that natural science applies to organic life. The Christian view of the world and the evolutionary are in sharp antagonism. After the first chapter, introducing the subject generally, the history of religion had to be treated in detail. The “History of Religion” follows a downward course. That of the Indo-Germanic tribes, which stand highest, comes first. Hindus, Iranians, Greeks, Romans and Germans follow on in turn. Buddhism serves as a transition to the religions of the south—to the Chinese of the Malay peninsula—from whom the Hamites (the Egyptians) and Semites are not far removed. These latter are of the utmost consequence in the history of revelation, because some are closely connected with the race of the chosen people, to whom revelation was entrusted, and others were for centuries in contact with them. The History of Religion closes with uncivilized races, which cannot be regarded either as the ideal of incorrupt humanity nor as the semi-brute commencement of the race. Everywhere, however, both among civilized and uncivilized peoples, there has been preserved at least a smoldering ember of ancient religious truth; everywhere at least the negative preparation for the salvation to come had been completed.

A positive preparation, in the strict sense, must come from God, and

it is found in the history of Israel, the chosen people. This fact alone would go far to justify the history of the Old Testament. But there is in addition a twofold and weighty reason. On the one hand, rationalist historians of tradition deny the revealed character of the Old Testament; on the other, theologians of the critical school call in question the origin and history of the canon. For this reason it was necessary to subject to a searching scrutiny the hypothesis of Graf and Wellhausen, from the point of view both of the history of religion and of biblical criticism. For only when the revealed character of the Old Testament has been made secure against attacks can revelation itself be examined more closely. Besides, it must not be forgotten that the consequences of this theory spread to the New Testament. Christianity is said to be not a new revelation, or indeed a revelation at all, but the outcome of religious development, the result of a blending of the Greek spirit with the Semitic religion. The chapter on the origin of Christianity is intended to meet these objections and at the same time to point out the relation of Christianity to other religions. And thus it is most clearly shown that the religious truth of the Old and New Testament, with its practical bearings and moral effects can only be explained by divine revelation.

The meaning of revelation, and its possibility, necessity, kind and manner had then to be expounded. Next its bearing on human knowledge made it incumbent under the heading *Reason and Revelation* to explain the *criteria* of revelation, that is *miracles* and *prophecies*, as they are motives for faith in a divine revelation. The miracles of Christianity in the spiritual life, in overcoming internally and externally the heathen sinful world, naturally follow. The antipathy of the modern world to the supernatural has called these criteria of revelation much into requisition. Hence it was indispensably necessary to examine closely, with special reference to the natural knowledge of the present day, how far miracles are either possible or knowable. The importance of the prophecies led further to a closer examination of the spirit of the Old Testament revelation. As, in this, it was necessary to start with the received *canon*, it became necessary to treat both in general and particular the question of the credibility of Holy Scripture. And thus was laid the ground-work for the life of Jesus Christ. Credibility was proved both by the history of the canon and by testimonies of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church to Holy Scripture as a whole and as to its several parts. In deciding this question it is of the utmost importance to understand clearly both the *nature* and *extent* of inspiration. An exact distinction between what is of faith and morals and what is only side matter, between things sacred and profane, is not merely founded on Holy Scripture itself and deduced from its purpose, but is likewise required by the advance of secular science. The boundary is ill-defined, and on many points the reader and the commentator will be left in painful uncertainty and suspense. Hence prudence is required in *interpreting* the sacred Scriptures in the sense in which they were inspired. Without the "spirit of the Church" no absolute certainty in matters of faith is possible. As the ground-work of the life of Christ, the Gospels containing His glad tidings require special treatment. The relation of the synoptic Gospels to one another and to the Gospel of St. John forms the "Gospel-question" which for a hundred years has held the chief place in New Testament criticism. The hypothesis of Griesbach and the Mark-hypothesis are efforts to solve by the dependence-hypothesis the synoptic problem which the tradition-hypothesis avoids. A fusion of the two after the example of St. Augustine has the greatest weight of

probability in its favor. The credibility and genuineness of the fourth Gospel are of supreme importance for the Life of Christ and for any estimate of His character. These, then, are the materials for the life of Christ, from the crib at Bethlehem to the ascension from the Mount of Olives. The biblical doctrine concerning the *person* and *nature* of Christ is set forth, and in particular it is shown that the doctrine of His *divinity* is attested by both Gospels and Epistles. The formal proof for His *divinity* is given in the chapter on the *doctrine* and *work* of Christ.

In a further section the condition of the two natures and their mutual relations are studied, though not so fully as would be done in a treatise on dogmatic theology. Thus the apology for Christianity, in its strictest sense is concluded. It forms the introduction and ground-work of the apology for the *Church of Christ*.

NATURAL THEOLOGY. By *Bernard Boedder, S. J.* New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1891. \$1.50.

This work of Father Boedder is the concluding volume of the "Manuals of Catholic Philosophy," published by the Jesuit Fathers of Stonyhurst College, England, especially for English readers. It may be well to give here a complete list of these admirable works, the first of their kind that have appeared in the English language: I. "Logic," by Richard F. Clarke, S. J.; II. "First Principles of Knowledge," by John Rickaby, S. J. III. "General Metaphysics," by John Rickaby, S. J.; IV. "Psychology," by Michael Maher, S. J.; V. "Natural Theology," by Bernard Boedder, S. J.; VI. "Moral Philosophy," by Joseph Rickaby, S. J. His Holiness, Leo XIII., gave his cordial approval to these publications in the vernacular in a letter directed to the Bishop of Salford, in whose diocese Stonyhurst College exists. We feel that English-speaking Catholics all over the world owe a lasting debt of gratitude to the Jesuit Fathers for this series, and hope the welcome it will receive from the public will be in accordance with its great merit.

German and French Catholic literature is rich in philosophical works published by learned professors to meet the intellectual errors of the day. Our German brethren especially seem to be keenly alive to the necessity of such works in the present conflict between the Church and infidelity. We need the same for the higher education and intellectual development of our people, not merely as text-books in our colleges and academies, but also for those who realize that their faith is indeed their pearl without price, which they should not only preserve at all risks, but be able also to defend from all attacks of every enemy, and to-day *the* enemy is infidelity, or agnosticism. To meet this enemy a philosophical training is absolutely necessary, and that training can now be had, not in a dead language, as heretofore, but in their own English tongue, in these learned volumes. Balme's "Fundamental Philosophy" has been heretofore almost the only work in English, and even it was limited in its scope. We have now in this series a complete course of philosophy, with the exception of cosmology.

The author follows the well-known track of all Catholic writers on natural theology, but draws his illustrations and objections from modern authors, thus adapting his work to our own times and to the difficulties most commonly urged by modern infidelity.

After an introductory chapter on the difference between natural and dogmatic theology, the author divides his work into three books: the first on the existence of God, the second on the divine attributes, the

third on the action of God upon this world. In the first book, beginning with the views of monotheistic philosophers on the natural foundation of a reasonable belief in God, he passes on to a lengthy refutation of ontologism, and then considers the so called ontological argument, or argument *a priori* of St. Anselm, which must not be confounded with ontologism. He then gives the direct proofs for the existence of God: (a) The metaphysical argument of an intelligent First Cause or Personal God; (b) The argument from design, or the physical argument; (c) The universal belief of the human race, or the moral argument. He admits that the first, or metaphysical, proof is the only one which is independent, and that the other two are only proofs, inasmuch as they are aided by the first.

He next considers the fundamental attributes of God, passing from self-existence to unity and the rest, instead of to infinity, as most philosophers do.

In treating of the fundamental relation of God to the world he refutes pantheism and develops the doctrine of creation. Perhaps the most interesting chapter of this book is the last, where he answers the difficulties against these fundamental truths of natural theology. Seeing the refutation of ontologism, we looked with some curiosity whether the author would speak of the immediate consciousness of God as laid down in the writings of some of the Fathers, and found that he did not omit that difficulty, but treated it very briefly in one of the appendices. He mentions St. Justin, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian and Augustine, but makes no quotations. In less than a page he gives his answer to these difficulties, which he divides into two classes, and refers to Kleutgen's large work on scholastic philosophy for a fuller explanation.

In the second book all the divine attributes are considered—immortality, eternity, immensity, the divine intellect, the divine will, omnipotence and the metaphysical essence of God.

The third book belongs more properly to cosmology, and treats of divine preservation and concurrence, divine providence and the existence of evil and the possibility of a supernatural providence.

Some of these questions naturally introduce the famous controversy between the Jesuit and Dominican schools of theology, and our author speaks of them only so far as his subject requires.

We do hope that our intelligent Catholics will be inspired to procure for themselves all these manuals of Catholic philosophy. We feel sure that students of philosophy in our seminaries will welcome their appearance and make good use of their clear, forcible and practical arguments. But why should their use be restricted to seminaries and colleges? We desire to see them finding a place in the libraries of Catholic gentlemen. They may be a little hard and dry reading at first; they certainly demand serious attention, reflection and study, but the more they are studied, the more fascinating they will become, and, what is best of all, they will furnish the reader with the weapons he needs so badly to protect himself against the insidious attacks of infidelity, and will show him the firm foundations presupposed by his faith.

THE LIFE OF JESUS CHRIST ACCORDING TO THE GOSPEL HISTORY. By Rev. A. J. Maas, S. J., Professor of Oriental Languages in Woodstock College, Md. St. Louis: B. Herder, 1891. \$2.00.

The Abbé Fouard's beautiful life of our Divine Lord, translated into excellent English by George F. X. Griffith, was introduced to Catholic readers by His Eminence Cardinal Manning, and at once received a cor-

dial welcome, as filling a long-felt want. It was the fruit of years of study and travel in the Holy Land. Of it the Cardinal says: "The history of Abbé Fouard unites the sacred narrative of the three-and-thirty years of Our Saviour's earthly life with the living consciousness of faith, in which the mutual personal relation and the mutual personal love of the Divine Master and His disciples are as living and sustaining at this day as they were when He ascended into heaven." Father Maas, in his life of Our Saviour, allows the four Gospels, in their own inspired language, to give us all the facts of that history. He tells us that "the text is entirely framed out of the words of the Gospels in such manner that nothing is omitted and nothing added. With regard to chronology, the harmonies of Tischendorf, Friedlieb, Coleridge, Lohmann, Fillion, Gilmore and Abbott have been consulted." In the notes which have been added, besides the classical commentators on the Gospels, he has made use also of such modern writers as Schuster, Reischl, Corluy, Schaff, Milligan, Fellow, Geikie, Farrar, Sepp, Stanley, Fouard and others. His notes, for the most part, are explanatory, and not devotional. On all controverted points he simply states the various opinions, being satisfied with assigning to each a greater or lesser probability.

As Father Coleridge's "Life of Our Life" has long been out of print, and his voluminous work explanatory of that Life cannot hope for a wide circulation, this volume of Father Maas, as His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons says in his letter of approbation, "supplies a long-felt want. . . . The book is calculated to interest and benefit all classes of readers, but to priests and religious it will be of special assistance."

In an introductory dissertation of nineteen pages the author speaks of the origin of the four gospels, contrasts the synoptic gospels with that of St. John, and dwells briefly on their chronology, thus to show in a negative way the truth of the gospel account. He next gives a positive argument for their genuineness and truthfulness drawn from the tradition of the Church and the testimony of heretics. He speaks of the four Evangelists as their authors, and vindicates the genuineness of the last part of St. Mark's Gospel, xvi., 9-20; as also of John viii., 9-11, which contains the story of the woman taken in adultery.

We have gone over the notes carefully, and find that the learned author has not allowed any passage which required explanation to escape his notice. The notes, it is true, are very concise, but that became a necessity if the work was to be completed in one volume. We would, however, have wished to see some of the texts more fully developed, *e.g.*, Matt. i. 25, Luke ii. 7, Matt. xxvi. 26.

We have, however, nothing but words of commendation for the work. It is a most valuable compendium of scriptural commentary, including whatever is good in the latest modern researches. As Cardinal Gibbons says, "to priests and religious it will be of special assistance," but we hope that it will find an entrance into every Catholic family. There can be no better book for spiritual reading than the gospels; there can be no better explanation of the gospels themselves than to read them harmonized, and when to such a harmony is added an explanation of every difficult passage, a description of the country and the various places, of the individuals, classes and sects, of the laws and customs of the times and peoples, then a new and wonderful light is thrown on the "good tidings," and we feel sure that the sacred word would be not only read with interest, but studied and meditated on with the greatest spiritual delight and immense spiritual benefit. Now all this is done in this "Life of Jesus Christ." The book is enriched by three maps, one of Palestine in the time of Christ, the second giving the nine journeys

made by our Lord during his public ministry, the last a bird's-eye view of modern Jerusalem. It contains also an excellent analytical index and an index to Scripture references. The work is printed for Mr. Herder by the New York Catholic Protectory Press, and is a credit to that institution.

THE LETTERS OF THE LATE FATHER GEORGE PORTER, S.J., Archbishop of Bombay.
London: Burns & Oates, Limited. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co.

These published letters of Bishop Porter are very pleasant reading, far more pleasant in our opinion, than would have been a biography from the pen of the dearest friend or warmest admirer.

Never dreaming that at some future day they would be published, the author wrote them in that easy, familiar vein which, in letters especially, is ever to be preferred to the more elevated and labored style. They treat of a variety of themes; many of them no doubt will have but little interest for the general reader, written as they were to persons peculiarly situated and in answer to souls spiritually perplexed and doubtful, yet for all that, the book contains much valuable information. Incidentally the author, who clearly was a well read and exceptionally able man—throws a flood of light on books and questions that are near and dear to the heart of the general Catholic reader. How lucidly in a letter to a friend (dated April 30, 1883,) he writes of the Immaculate Conception: "You ask me, for the Count, how we prove the Immaculate Conception. By any chance have you the letter I wrote you for Count S— on that subject? It would answer much of your question. The great point is to understand what is meant by the Immaculate Conception. It means that the soul of the mother of Jesus, when it was created by God to be united to her body born of Joachim and Anna, as the bodies of other children, did not contract the taint of original sin, as the souls of all who are descended from Adam in the ordinary way; but by a special privilege in consideration of the merits of her Divine Son, that she might be a worthy temple of this Divine child, she was preserved from this taint, and at her creation received from God the robe of grace, just as Eve received it when she was created before Adam had sinned. We prove the Immaculate Conception from the tradition, which has always taught that the Blessed Virgin Mary was never for *one instant* the slave of sin and the devil, that she from the first instant of her existence waged war against the devil, and that she overcame him through her Divine Son. This proof we read in Genesis iii., v. 15. This is, in short, our proof."

Hear him again in a letter to a friend, where he writes of Höttinger's work on the Church, which he was translating. "I like the book better and better. It explains very fully the prerogatives of St. Peter, always leading up to the 'bond of union;' then the position and privileges of the Apostles; lastly the Divine institution of the Episcopate and the duties of the Episcopate vis-a-vis of the Primacy; all matters of highest importance in our day. Sometimes it comes home to me that where non-Catholics are weakest is in their conception of the Church and of St. Peter's place. They quite leave out St. Peter, and without St. Peter there can be no Church."

In another letter written to a friend who had been reading the conferences of Freppel and had written to our author of the impressions it made on him, he says: "The feeling which the conferences of Freppel have awakened in you is in some respects right, but it may easily carry

you too far. We believe that the one road to everlasting happiness made known in revelation is the Church, Christ's Kingdom on Earth, which rests on faith in God and His Son Jesus Christ whom He has sent into the world. At the same time we believe that many will be saved who never gain admittance into the visible Church, and never become visible members of Christ's Kingdom on Earth. Such souls do the best they can in their circumstances; they avoid wrong and do good up to the measure of light they have received, some as pagans, some as sincere heretics, some as unbelievers. It may be that some of these, rising to a certain level in their ignorance of any thing higher, spend better lives than they would have done had they received the light of revelation. But it would be wrong to suppose them incapable of taking on the fuller truth; every one who comes into the world, and reaches the use of reason, is capable of knowing and loving Jesus Christ." These are quotations taken at random, but they give, we think, a fair evidence of both the style and matter of many of the letters contained in the work.

COMPENDIUM THEOLOGIÆ MORALIS. A. Joanne Petro Gury, S. J. Primo conscriptum et deinde ab Antonio Ballerini ejusdem societatis adnotationibus auctum, etc. Ab Aloysio Sabetti, S. J., in Collegio Woodstockiensi, S. J. Theologiæ Moralis Professore. Editio Sexta. Fr. Pustet & Co., New York, Cincinnati, 1891.

No better sign of the popularity of this "Manual of Moral Theology" could be desired than the constant demand for new editions. This is the *sixth* revised edition, and knowing that almost all the various editions must have been taken by the clergy of this country, it speaks well for the authority the work has obtained as one of the very best books for study and reference, whether in the seminary or for the busy missionary. Father Sabetti's work is based on Ballerini's third edition of Gury, in which Ballerini gives his answers to the difficulties proposed in the *Vindiciæ Alphonsianæ*. There are no notes whatsoever in this volume. Whatsoever seemed desirable to the author he has incorporated into his text.

As Gury's work has especial relation to the French law, Father Sabetti has treated all such topics in their relation to the laws of the United States and those of the different States.

The treatise on censures has been entirely revised according to the constitution "*Apostolica Sedis*," and the interpretation of the same by the best commentators, especially Father Dumas. The latest decrees of the Roman Congregations have been added, some of which are of the greatest importance for the solution of grave questions, v. g. p., 705.

The author declares that he has verified every quotation he has taken from any author. His object he declares to be to give a *short and practical manual* for seminarians and missionary priests. For seminaries it will be most useful as a text-book, because it contains no lengthy dissertations, no controversies, no doubtful or new points of doctrine, but short and solid solutions of all questions, which the professor is expected to explain and illustrate. For missionaries it is invaluable, for they have here the answer to almost every practical question which may arise in the course of their ministry. The author gives the result of his vast experience as a professor of moral theology for very many years, during which he has been consulted in every kind of difficult case arising out of the special circumstances of our people and of the country. There are many such solutions which cannot be found in any other treatise of moral theology. Besides the general index, there is also an excellent alphabetical index of every question treated of in the book.

The work has been published in the most substantial form, good type, fine paper, strong binding.

It has received the cordial approval of many of the archbishops and bishops of the country, and with Koning's ought to find a place in every priest's library.

THE ISRAELITE BEFORE THE ARK OF THE COVENANT AND THE CHRISTIAN BEFORE THE ALTAR; or a History of the Worship of God in two parts. Part I. The worship of God among the children of Israel before the days of Jesus Christ. Part II. The worship of God since the days of Jesus Christ or the rites, ceremonies and Sacrifice of the Catholic Church. By *L. de Goesbriand*, Bishop of Burlington. Burlington: The Free Press Association, Printers.

This is a work both interesting and instructive. Of the history of religion, especially under the old dispensation, men generally have a very imperfect knowledge. There is no disputing this fact. We are forever talking of the Scriptures, making it our boast that we have read and reread them, and yet for the most part what have we gathered from them?

Take the moral laws of the Jews, take their sacrifices, what do the most of us know of them? Almost nothing. We talk of the Tabernacle and the Temple, the Priests and Levites, and yet our notions of those same things are the most meagre and obscure. The fault, of course, lies with ourselves; we read, but we read amiss.

In his "History of the Worship of God" the Bishop of Burlington brings to us in clear and simple style a thorough knowledge of those things. He gives us a history, a continuous history, of the worship of God from the beginning. He tells us of the Ark of the Covenant, of the Tabernacle, of the Temple, of the Priests and Levites and Sacrifices in so masterful a way that one is almost brought to fancy that he has seen and touched them. So, too, with equal skill and clearness, does the author, in the second part of his work, bring before us a knowledge of the history and great events of the New Testament. With rare skill he shows us the relations existing between the events of the Old and New Testaments, how one thing is the foreshadowing of another, how the former has its fulfilment in the latter, both making one harmonious and uninterrupted whole. Of the Mass—the great Sacrifice of the new law—the Bishop, in the second part, discourses most learnedly and eloquently. He gives us its history. He traces its foreshadowings in the sacrifices of the old law; tells us of its efficacy, and makes it, as it truly is, the great central doctrine of the Church.

The book is clearly the fruit of long and loving study, of close familiarity with and profound knowledge of the sacred Scriptures. It will, we are sure, be greatly appreciated by both the priesthood and the people.

THE LIFE OF ST. JOHN BAPTIST DE ROSSI. Translated from the Italian by *Lady Herbert*. Introduction on ecclesiastical training and the sacerdotal life, by the Bishop of Salford. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1891.

For two reasons we extend warm welcome to the American edition of the life of St. John Baptist de Rossi; we welcome it first, for its own sake; for the great good its careful perusal is sure to effect; and secondly for the masterly and most beautiful introduction of the Bishop of Salford, which prefaces the work. Indeed were we to say that we welcome the work first for the introduction, and secondly for the beauty and in-

terest of the life it portrays, we would be giving truer expression to our feelings not that the life of St. John Baptist de Rossi is wanting in interest, for it is fascinating and moreover written in a style that commands admiration, but because of the ringing sincerity and pre-eminent importance and timeliness of Bishop Vaughan's words. It is truly a noble introduction, and it is noble in its truthfulness and manly candor; it is inspiring.

Of course it is only to the priesthood and clergy, to the secular, or missionary priesthood, that the earnest, truthful words of the bishop will be all we claim for them. For it is to them and not to the general reader he addresses himself. But alike for priest and people the life of St. John Baptist de Rossi, will, we are sure, have highest interest, and be most profitable. His was a beautiful life; so sweet and simple, so entirely for God. And yet what a busy practical life it was! just the life, the work and deeds demanded of every missionary priest throughout the land. What priest can read the story of that life and not be stimulated and inspired to greater things than he has heretofore accomplished. And for the people too, it will, we are sure, do great things. It will bring them closer to their clergy. For in the love and tenderness and self-sacrifice of St. John Baptist de Rossi for the people amongst whom he labored they will see what the priesthood is to them. To Lady Herbert we owe a debt of gratitude for giving us in English so clear and elegant, this excellent work.

THE LIFE OF THE VENERABLE MADELINE BARAT. Foundress of the Society of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. Drawn and abridged from the French by *Lady Georgiana Fullerton*. New York: P. O'Shea, publisher, 45 Warren street. 1891.

This is a delightful book. It is, as it purports to be, a history of the beautiful life of the Foundress of the Society of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, and it is at the same time a most interesting history of the origin, the growth, and wondrous achievements of the Society of which she was the chief corner-stone. Wondrously from the beginning, step by step, did the providence of God watch over and lead that beautiful soul in the path marked out for her. This no reader of the book can fail to perceive and respect. Equally interesting and edifying also to all who read the work, must be the singular docility with which that young girl, through many a trial and many a sacrifice, followed the designs of God, as made known to her by her remarkable brother and the other directors in whose hands God had placed the guidance of her soul. How true it is that the greatest achievements have had the humblest beginnings! Few who know the Society only as it now exists can bring themselves to realize what it was in the year 1800; what great things it has done for God and Religion since that date. Greater far than is within our power to measure. We cheerfully recommend the work. It is both edifying and instructive. It is sure to bring men nearer to God.

MOSES BAR KEPHA UND SEIN BUCH VON DER SEELE. Von *Dr. Oscar Braun*. Freiburg im Breisgau, Herdersche Verlagshandlung. St. Louis: B. Herder. 1891. \$1.40, net.

Moses Bar Kepha, or Moses the son of Peter, was one of the writers of the Syriac Monophysites. He was born in 815, at Baldad, on the Tigris. He was educated and instructed in the Sacred Scriptures by Rabban Cyriacus, the Archimandrite of the renowned monastery of

Mar Sergius, and by Ignatius of Karonta and Habib. He became a religious in that monastery, and afterwards, in the year 863, was consecrated Bishop of Mossul, as also of Bet Raman and Bet Kionaya, when he took the name of Severus. He wrote a commentary on many of the books of Sacred Scripture, a work on heresies, and also a history of the Church. He died in February, 903—according to Greek reckoning, 1214.

It was whilst pursuing his studies in the Vatican Library that Dr. Braun became interested in this manuscript of Moses Bar Kepha in so far as it had relation to his investigations concerning anthropology and eschatology. He divides his book into two parts. In the first he gives a life of the author; an account of his writings, exegetical, philosophical, liturgical and homiletic; his doctrine on creation, origin and fall and on the sacraments. In the second he gives a translation from the Syriac of his work on the soul, according to the Vatican manuscript.

As in the course of his studies he consulted various Jacobite and Nestorian writers, he gives as an appendix their opinions bearing on his subject, such as the faculties of the soul, its definition, on the doctrine of emanation, the generation of the soul, its pre-existence, the time of its creation, the sleep of the soul, the earthly paradise as the abode of just souls till the day of judgment, the creation of the soul after God's image, on prayer for the dead and purgatory.

HANDBOOK OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. For the use of advanced students and the educated laity. By the *Rev. W. Wilmers, S. J.* From the German. Edited by *Rev. James Conway, S. J.*; Canisius College, Buffalo, N. Y. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros., Printers to the Holy Apostolic See. 1891.

This is an excellent book. Here and there we could wish for a fuller development of certain questions, not that in their present form they are obscure, but that they might be brought home in all their completeness to the young minds for whom the work is intended. Of course the work is but a handbook or catechism, and does not aim at the fullest and completest exposition of the subjects of which it treats. This we understand, and therefore do not urge our point as an imperfection.

For the students of our colleges and the educated laity the work is most admirably adapted, exactly what was wanted. On the questions which at the present time are claiming so much attention, the creation of the world, the origin of man, etc., it is very satisfactory. In regard to those questions we have in the past been altogether too indifferent, and in consequence have been but poorly equipped to meet and answer the subtleties and sophistries of the enemies of the Christian religion. Henceforth these questions must receive our closest and most serious attention. Above all things we must bring these questions in their true light home to our youth. This is a reading generation, and if we fail in our duty, our young men and young women will drink in the poison of unbelief and be lost to us and to their own salvation. We cheerfully recommend this work of Father Wilmers, and wish it the greatest measure of success.

LA VIDA DE S. LUIS GONZAGA PATRONO DE LA JUVENTUD CRISTIANA. Por el *P. M. Meschler*, de la Campaña de Jesús. B. Herder, Libero-Editor Pontificio. 1891. \$1.20.

The celebration of the third centenary of the death of St. Aloysius

was the occasion not merely of a wonderful spread of devotion over the Catholic world in honor of the Angelic Youth, but it brought out, as well, new editions of his saintly life. Almost all such lives have been translations of the authentic memoirs written by Father Ceparo, S. J., the master of novices of St. Aloysius.

The Bollardists, in their life of the saint, were able to add some new facts to that history. For the third centenary Father Meschler, a German Jesuit living in exile in Holland, composed a new life of our saint, which speedily reached a second edition. It is no mere republication of the old lives. He brings out clearly every little incident in the short career of our saint, and draws the proper lesson.

The work was translated almost immediately into French by the Abbé Lebrequier, of the diocese of Bayeux, and now Mr. Herder publishes this beautiful Spanish translation, which has the approbation of many of the Spanish bishops. As it was printed at their press in Freiburg, Breisgau, it is a model both in type and paper. Three phototypes embellish the volume. Two are portraits of the saint taken from authentic paintings; the one represents him as a page at court, and the other as a novice of the Society of Jesus. This latter is familiar to us from having seen the face in the room where he died in the Roman College. It is the only true picture we have ever seen published. This alone should induce lovers of St. Aloysius to buy this book. The frontispiece represents St. Charles giving his first communion to St. Aloysius.

THE HISTORY OF ST. DOMINIC. Founder of the Friars preachers. By *Augusta Theodosia Drane*, author of "The History of St. Catherine of Sienna and Her Companions," "Christian Schools and Schools," etc. London; Longmans, Green & Co.; and New York: 15 East 16th Street. 1891.

We take the greatest pleasure in recommending to the Catholic world this delightful "History of St. Dominic." The title of the book does it but scant justice. It is, to be sure, a history of St. Dominic, but it is much more, much more that is pre-eminently interesting and instructive and of highest value to the cause of truth and religion. Of the times of St. Dominic, the state of society and of religion, as then existing, the author has given us a picture most vivid and, we are convinced, most truthful. Of the Albigenses we have here read as never before had we read. How strange it is that from time to time we meet with men who take it upon themselves to defend so vile and wicked an association; for not only were their doctrines antagonistic to the Church, but subversive of all morality and destructive of authority, civil as well as ecclesiastical. For her noble and heroic work in overthrowing that gigantic evil which struck at the very foundations of domestic life and civic order, the Church is deserving the everlasting gratitude of Christendom. She was in that instance the veritable saviour of the world. Of the noble part borne by St. Dominic in that mighty struggle, of his sweet patience under the most trying circumstances, of his deep and pure love for the salvation of men's souls as brought out in that struggle, the author tells us in a masterly way. The history of the foundation and growth of our Saint's order as told us by the author is indeed delightful reading, fascinating as anything we have read for many a day.

The book is written in excellent style and taste, and we trust will meet with the success it merits.

LETTERS AND CORRESPONDENCE OF JOHN HENRY NEWMAN DURING HIS LIFE IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH. With a brief autobiography. Edited at Cardinal Manning's request, by *Anne Mozley*. New York and London: Longmans, Green, & Co.

The two volumes of which this work consists, reached us as the last form of the REVIEW was on the point of going to press, and too late to permit the writing of a Notice at all commensurate with the high interest and value of the work. We have only time and room to say that no one can have a full and complete knowledge of the life and interior character of Cardinal Newman up to the time of his reception into the Catholic Church without a careful perusal of these volumes. Taken together with his *Apologia* they furnish a faithful and vivid portrait of this eminently great and holy man, his ruling ideas, and inmost thoughts. They throw a clear light, too, upon university life at Oxford and upon many incidents connected with the Tractarian movement, heretofore not clearly known or understood.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF KATERI TEKAKWITHA, THE LILY OF THE MOHAWKS, 1656-1680. By *Ellen H. Walworth*, author of "An Old World as Seen through Young Eyes." Buffalo: Peter Paul & Brother. 1891.

"The Life and Times of Kateri Takakwitha" is a charming story, charmingly told. Interwoven with the story of the Indian maiden's life, is a wealth of Indian history and tradition that is delightfully refreshing. Incidentally the book throws much light on the history of the early missions to the Indians of the Mohawk Valley and adjacent country. The author's style is clear and simple. We like it much. We trust that she will go on in her chosen field, in which she will attain, we have not a doubt, the most enviable success.

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW (Monthly). Edited by *Rev. H. J. Heuser*. Fr. Pustet & Co.: New York and Cincinnati. October, 1891.

The *American Ecclesiastical Review* grows in interest and in value with each succeeding number. That for October has the following table of contents: The Commonwealth and the Incomplete Societies within the Commonwealth; The Ministry of Catechising; A Legend of Our Lady; Irregularitas ex Hæresi; The Church and the Irish Language; Letters on Christian Art; Titular Feasts in October; Conference; Analecta; Book Review; List of Books Received.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

VISITS TO THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT AND TO THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY (for every day in the month). By *St. Alphonsus de Liguori*, Doctor of the Church. New York, Cincinnati and St. Louis: Benziger Brothers.

THE SCHISM OF THE WEST AND THE FREEDOM OF PAPAL ELECTIONS. By *Rev. Henry A. Braun, D.D.*, Rector of St. Agnes Church, New York: Benziger Bros. 1891.

SIMPLICITY IN PRAYER. By the author of "Les Petites Fleurs." From the French. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1891.

THE HOLY MASS EXPLAINED. By *Rev. F. X. Schoupe, S. J.* Translated by *Rev. P. O'Hare*. Fr. Pustet & Co.: New York and Cincinnati.

THE PRECIOUS BLOOD. By *Richard F. Clarke, S. J.* Benziger Brothers. 1891.

70749

PERIODICAL

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

